

PI  
5213  
W562

UC-NRLF



QB 381 638









# GRAMMAR

OF THE

# CHALDEE LANGUAGE,

AS CONTAINED IN THE

BIBLE AND THE TARGUMS.

BY  
*George B. Winer*  
DR. GEORGE B. WINER,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, ETC. IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LEIPSIC.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN

BY

H. B. HACKETT,

Professor of Biblical Literature in Newton Theological Institution.

---

ANDOVER:

PUBLISHED BY ALLEN, MORRILL AND WARDWELL.

NEW YORK: MARK H. NEWMAN.

1845.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1845, by  
ALLEN, MORRILL AND WARDWELL,  
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Massachusetts.

LOAN STACK

GIFT

P R E F A C E .

---

As a practical grammar of the Chaldee language, that of Dr. Winer is undoubtedly the best which can be placed in the hands of the student. The first edition of this work was published in 1824; and it is this, for substance, which was translated by Mr. Riggs, and printed at Andover in 1832. The grammar here offered to the public, which appeared in Germany in 1842, has undergone a complete revision, and may be considered as essentially a new production. In the interval between the two editions, the most important works of Gesenius in Hebrew and Chaldee literature, those also of Ewald, Fürst and others, have made their appearance; and the materials for a scientific treatment of Chaldee grammar have thus been rendered far more complete than at any former period. All that is truly valuable, and at the same time pertinent to the subject, which the labors of these distinguished scholars have produced, the author has faithfully appropriated in this new edition; while he has added to them the results of his own maturer and more extended studies, in this department of philology, since the publication of his first more elementary treatise. The introduction, on the subject of the Chaldee language and literature, will be found to be almost entirely new; the various topics successively introduced are discussed with far greater fulness and precision; the survey, both of the general facts and of the more infrequent phenomena of the language, is more minute, and authenticated by a much greater variety of references and examples; while the Syntax, which was almost wholly wanting in the first edition, has here been re-written, and brought at least to as perfect a state, as the same division of Hebrew grammar in the ablest works which treat of that language.

In preparing this work for the public, the writer has confined himself in the main to the mere task of translation. An occasional, unimportant remark has been inserted in the body of the grammar, and a few supplementary pages have been added at the end; but further than this no change has been attempted; and the only responsibility, therefore, which he assumes is that of having endeavored to furnish a correct representation of the original. The Chaldee portions of the work have been set up directly from the printed text of Winer, without transcription; and if they are found

to be conformed to the text itself, it is hoped that the translator will be considered as having discharged his duty in this respect. It is deemed the more important to make this remark, because the original German work does not appear to have had the benefit of that careful revision in passing through the press, which a scholar like Winer would have bestowed upon it, had he charged himself with this labor; and hence some negligences may present themselves on a closer study of the grammar (though not a few such have been removed), which would naturally enough escape attention in the mere act of proof reading. It is impossible that they should be such as to occasion the student any practical inconvenience. It is not often that such a multitude of references both to biblical passages and to various literary and critical works, occur crowded together within the same compass, as will be found in the following pages. Perfect accuracy in every one of these instances is of course unattainable. The translator has experienced an occasional disappointment in attempting to trace some of these references; and it is possible that the reader may experience the same. A few errors of this kind, which happened to be observed, have been corrected; but it was not supposed to be necessary, even had the means for this purpose within reach rendered it practicable, to subject this part of the work to a complete revision. Some peculiarities in the mode of printing the Chaldee will be remarked by the reader. The *Daghesh lene* is universally omitted in the *aspirates*; except in the Paradigms of verbs and nouns, where (though omitted there likewise in the original) it was thought best to insert it, as a matter of convenience to the learner. This, though not usual in books printed in this country, is very common in works from the German press; and to the student who has been trained to habits of correct pronunciation in Hebrew, it cannot possibly give rise to any embarrassment. It will be noticed also that a few words are now and then written without the vowel-signs, for the most part in cases where the same words are repeated, or where the point which they illustrate, lies in the form of the word rather than its vocalization. It will be understood, when such examples occur, that they are the result of design, not an accident or oversight.

No Chrestomathy, or Vocabulary accompanies the present grammar. The author of it has here treated indeed of the Chaldee language in all its extent;\* and has furnished the materials for

---

\* I should except the Rabbinic or Talmudic, which is a species of Chaldee,



extending the study of it to all the remains of the Chaldee literature which have come down to us. It was supposed, however, that the object of most students in wishing to gain an acquaintance with this dialect would be to enable them to read the Chaldee portions of the Bible ; and that for this purpose an extended and expensive apparatus would not be necessary. A reprint of the biblical Chaldee would certainly be useless, as every Hebrew Bible contains it ; and the provision which Gesenius has made in the later editions of his *Lexicon* for the Chaldee words in *Ezra* and *Daniel*, does away with the necessity for a separate Glossary. The grammatical forms of these words, it is true, a general *Lexicon* like his does not discriminate ; and the student at first, unless he has the guidance of a teacher, may experience some difficulty in referring them to their proper classification. For the greater convenience of such as may wish to prosecute the study by themselves, a few pages, containing something like an analytical key to the Chaldee portions of the Bible, may be added hereafter as an accompaniment to the present grammar.

It may be proper to say, that the more immediate object which I have had in view in the publication of this work, was the accommodation of some of my own pupils who had expressed a desire to attend to the study of the Chaldee. It is hoped, however, that the circle of its usefulness may be extended yet more widely, and that a want of the theological public may be supplied by it, at present not otherwise provided for. A portion of the Word of God has been written in the Chaldee language ; and no one can have access to the entire, original Scriptures without an acquaintance with it. The labor of making this acquisition is not great, after the student has already laid a foundation for it in a knowledge of the Hebrew. The advantages which he may expect to realize from such study, are many and important. An extended enumeration of them it would be impossible to offer here. Some of them are well stated in the following remarks of a distinguished biblical scholar,\* to whom the writer acknowledges himself indebted, in common with so many others in our country, for his first instruction and impulse in sacred studies.

“First, a knowledge of the Chaldee is highly important in aiding the student more fully to understand the Hebrew. The basis

---

the idioms of which as distinguished from those of the Chaldee properly so called, Dr. Winer does not profess to exhibit in the present work.

\* The Rev. Prof. STUART of Andover, in a Preface written by him for the first edition of this grammar, to which reference has already been made.



of the Hebrew and Chaldee,\*in common with others of the Semitic languages, is well known by every good oriental scholar to be one and the same. The genius, structure, idiom, peculiarities of syntax, and a multitude of the words, are substantially the same in all; so that he who has acquired a radical acquaintance with any one of them, is prepared to make very rapid and easy progress in them all. The student who understands the Hebrew, has only to read through the pages of the following grammar, in order to be fully satisfied of the correctness of this statement. And if correct, then it is obvious, that in every step of his progress in the study of the Chaldee, he is gaining additional light and confirmation, in regard to the meaning, forms, and structure of the Hebrew. Again, the most important ancient helps extant, for illustrating the meaning of Hebrew words, are in the Chaldee language. The two Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan (which extend over the most considerable portion of the Old Testament), are more to be depended on in difficult cases, than any other aid to which we can resort, in all the store-houses of antiquity. Being of substantially the same idiom with the Hebrew, they often give us the exact shape, as well as meaning of the Hebrew, better than any or all other ancient versions. We may reasonably have a confidence in such ancient Chaldee translators that they, at least for the most part, rightly understood their original. Finally, several chapters in Ezra and Daniel, as exhibited in our Hebrew Bibles, are in the Chaldee language. The student, therefore, who designs to acquire the power of consulting *all* the original Scriptures, must make himself acquainted with the Chaldee language."

It may be added, that in all probability the vernacular language of the writers of the New Testament was the Chaldee, or a dialect very similar to it; and consequently that its idioms and modes of thought must have had an important influence upon the manner in which they employed the Greek language. Not a few of those peculiarities which distinguish the Greek of the New Testament, are decidedly Aramaean rather than Hebrew; and hence without a knowledge of the Chaldee, we should be wanting in some of the means necessary for enabling us to interpret critically even the Gospels and the writings of the Apostles.

H. B. H.

*Newton Theol. Institution, }*  
*June 21, 1845. }*

# CONTENTS.

## INTRODUCTION.

### THE CHALDEE LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

Page  
9

## PART I.

### ELEMENTS, OR SIGNS FOR READING AND THEIR USE 21

1. Consonants . . . . .	21
2. Vowel Signs . . . . .	22
3. Place of the Tone . . . . .	24
4. Reading of Unpointed Text . . . . .	26

## PART II.

### ETYMOLOGY.

#### CHAPTER I.—GENERAL PRINCIPLES ON WHICH THE CHANGES OF WORDS DEPEND.

5. The Subject in General . . . . .	27
6. Mutations which affect the Consonants . . . . .	28
7. Mutations which affect the Vowels . . . . .	31

#### CHAPTER II.—THE PRONOUN.

8. Personal and Possessive Pronouns ; . . . .	33
9. Other Pronouns . . . . .	36

#### CHAPTER III.—THE VERB.

10. Derivation and Inflection of the Verb in General . . . . .	38
11. Inflection of the Regular Verb . . . . .	41
12. Remarks on the Paradigm of the Regular Verb . . . . .	46
13. Personal Inflection of the Participles . . . . .	50
14. Unusual Conjugations and Quadriliteral Verbs . . . . .	51
15. Guttural Verbs . . . . .	52
16. Regular Verbs with Suffixes. . . . .	54
17. Irregular Verb in general . . . . .	58
18. Verbs פָּר . . . . .	58
19. Verbs עָר or ע doubled . . . . .	61
20. Verbs פָּר (פָּר) . . . . .	64
21. Verbs פָּר . . . . .	65
22. Verbs עָר (עָר) . . . . .	66
23. Verbs לָר (לָר) . . . . .	70
24. Verbs doubly Anomalous . . . . .	75
25. Defective Verbs and Mixed Forms . . . . .	76
26. Irregular Verbs with Suffixes . . . . .	77

#### CHAPTER IV.—THE NOUN.

27. The Derivation of Nouns . . . . .	79
28. Nouns derived from the Regular Verb . . . . .	81
29. Nouns derived from the Irregular Verb . . . . .	83
30. Denominative Nouns . . . . .	84

31. Gender and Number of Nouns . . . . .	84
32. Different Relations (Status) of Nouns . . . . .	87
33. Declension of Nouns . . . . .	88
34. Remarks on the Paradigms of the Nouns . . . . .	93
35. Anomalous and Defective Nouns . . . . .	98
36. Adjectives and Numerals . . . . .	100

## CHAPTER V.—THE PARTICLES.

37. Adverbs . . . . .	104
38. Prepositions . . . . .	105
39. Conjunctions and Interjections . . . . .	106

## PART III.

## SYNTAX.

## CHAPTER I.—THE PRONOUN.

40. Use of the Personal and Possessive Pronouns . . . . .	108
41. Use of the Relative Pronouns . . . . .	110
42. Use of the Demonstrative and Interrogative Pronouns . . . . .	112
43. Expression of the Pronominal Forms which are wanting in Chaldee . . . . .	112

## CHAPTER II.—SYNTAX OF THE VERB.

44. Use of the two leading Tenses . . . . .	114
45. Modes of expressing certain Finite Tenses . . . . .	116
46. Use of the Imperative and Infinitive . . . . .	117
47. Use of the Participle . . . . .	118
48. The Optative . . . . .	120
49. Number and Person of the Verb . . . . .	120
50. Construction of Verbs with Dative and Accusative . . . . .	122
51. Verbs with Prepositions . . . . .	124
52. Use of Verbs in the place of Adverbs . . . . .	126
53. Constructio praeagnans, Brachylogy and Ellipsis of the Verb . . . . .	126

## CHAPTER IV.—SYNTAX OF THE NOUN.

54. Use of Nouns for Adjectives, and Expression of concrete Substantives . . . . .	127
55. Numbers, and the Repetition of Nouns . . . . .	128
56. Designation of the Cases . . . . .	129
57. The Noun in the Designation of subordinate Relations . . . . .	130
58. Expression of the Comparative and Superlative . . . . .	131
59. Construction of the Numerals . . . . .	132
60. Construction of Adjectives . . . . .	133
61. Nominative Absolute . . . . .	134

## CHAPTER IV.—SYNTAX OF THE PARTICLES.

62. Adverbs and Prepositions . . . . .	135
63. Use of the Negatives . . . . .	135
64. The Particles of Interrogation . . . . .	136

## APPENDIX.

No. I. Targums . . . . .	137
No. II. Talmud, Mishna, Gemara . . . . .	148
No. III. Is the Aramaean still spoken in the East? . . . . .	150
No. IV. The Zabian Dialect . . . . .	151



# INTRODUCTION.

---

## THE CHALDEE LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE.

1. THE term *Chaldee* is applied to that Semitic dialect, in which certain sections of the Old Testament and the Targums,<sup>1</sup> so called, are written. These Targums are translations and paraphrases of books of the Old Testament made by Jews, which belong to very different ages, and which, in reference to their linguistic and exegetical character, exhibit an important diversity. With this idiom connects itself the Talmudic dialect, as do also the few remains of the language of the Jews prevalent in Palestine in the time of Christ, and which are preserved in the New Testament, and in Josephus. The dialect of the Egyptian-Aramaean monuments, that have been recently discovered, is likewise a species of Chaldee.

With reference to their *linguistic* character, which alone claims our attention here, the above remains of the Chaldee may be divided into three classes. This dialect appears in its purest state, i. e. in its most peculiar and independent form, in the *Targum of Onkelos* on the Pentateuch, which is, at the same time, the oldest of these Targums. (See Winer's *Diss. de Onkeloso ejusque paraphrasi Chald.* Lips. 1819. 4. S. D. Luzzatto *de Onkel. Chald. Pentateuchi versione.* Vienn. 1830. 8.) The biblical Chaldee occupies the second place. As regards its lexical properties, it is not inferior, indeed, to the preceding; but in respect to orthography and grammar, it stands somewhat lower. (See J. F. Hirt *de Chaldaismo*

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix, No. I.—TR.

Cph. Helvici tractat. de Chaldaicis biblior. paraphrasib. Giess. 1612. 4. Carpzov., *Critica sacra* V. T. p. 431 sq. That which the more recent works on Introduction to the Old Testament contain, is to a great extent traditionary material, derived from these writings.

biblico. Jen. 1751. 4.) Various peculiarities of the Hebrew occur intermixed with it, as, e. g. the art. ה, the plural ending ים, the conjugations *Hiphil* and *Hophal*, and the writing of ה instead of א. Finally, the other Targums, among which that of Jonathan ben Uziel on the Prophets approaches nearest to that of Onkelos, are written in a language which is not only freely interspersed with foreign words, but presents also many peculiar formations (e. g. נ as praeformative of the Infinitive of Paël, Ithpeal and Ithpaal), some of which show an affinity to the Syriac or the Rabbinic, (as נ for the third person Future, the prefixed syllable נַ in the Passives), while others of them arise from contractions (as in the numerals). What Eichhorn (Einl. ins A. T. II, p. 6 sq. p. 90 sq.) remarks respecting these peculiarities, is not sufficiently complete; they deserve to be collected separately and made a subject of more extended notice. We have special, linguistic investigations only upon Pseudo-Jonathan on the Pentateuch and upon the Targum on the Proverbs; these have been constantly used in the sequel of the present work. Comp. J. H. Petermann de duab. Pentateuchi paraphrasib. Chald. Berol. 1829. 8. P. I, p. 64 sq. Dathe de ratione consensus vers. Chald. et Syr. Proverb. Lips. 1764. 4. (Opusc. p. 109 sq.)

The relation of the Talmudic dialect to the language of the Paraphrases, cannot be more closely investigated here; we remark only that there prevails an important difference between the idiom of the Mishna and that of the two Gemara.<sup>1</sup> The former is, lexically considered, a species of new Hebrew, but in its grammatical structure discovers the infusion of a strong Aramaean influence. Comp. especially Hartmann, Thesauri linguae Hebr. e Mishna augendi P. I. p. 9 sq. Besides, see J. E. Faber, Anmerk. z. Erlernung des Talmud. und Rabbin. Gött. 1770. 8. M. J. Landau, Geist und Sprache der Hebräer nach dem Tempelbaue. Prag. 1822. 8.

On the popular language of the Jews, current in Palestine in the time of Christ, see particularly Pfannkuche in Eichhorn's Biblioth. der bibl. Literatur VIII. 365 sq<sup>2</sup>. Comp. Winer's Bibl. Rw. II, 587 sq. (648 ?) This has usually been called the *Syro-Chaldaic* dialect,<sup>3</sup> and it is the same language which the Jews at that

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix, No. II.—Tr.

<sup>2</sup> This article has been translated by Dr. Robinson in the Bibl. Repository, Vol. I. p. 317 sq.—Tr.

<sup>3</sup> The appellation was first derived from Hieron. contra Pelag. 3. 1, where it is said that the original of Matthew's Gospel was written *Chaldaico-Syroque sermone*. A view of this idiom is given by Gesenius in Ersch and Gruber's Encyclop. I. XVI. 110.



time employed in their writings, as is shown by the fact (aside from the apocryphal books which originated in Palestine<sup>1</sup>) that Josephus wrote his work on the Jewish War in this language (De bello Jud. Praef. § 1.) It is called, in the New Testament, *Hebrew*, but in the Talmud, *Syriac* or *Aramaean*. Comp. R.w. II, 587. (648 ?) Anm. From the few remains of it extant, we could not infer with certainty a difference between this idiom and the language of the Paraphrases (Fürst p. 5). In Mark 15: 34, a well known passage of the Psalms is represented as cited by Jesus exactly in the language of the Paraphrases.

The *Egyptian-Aramaean* dialect is found upon some monuments belonging to Egypt, which proceeded for the most part from Jews resident in that country. They are the inscription of Carpentras and some papyrus rolls in the possession of the Museum at Turin and of the count de Blacas ; comp. Beer, *Inscriptiones ex papyri vett. Semit. quotquot in Aegypto reperti sunt*, etc. Lips. 1833. 4. P. I. Gesen., *Monumenta Phoenic.* I. 226 sq. The language is Aramaean, yet more allied to the Chaldee than the Syriac. The Inscriptions de Blacas, indeed, incline strongly towards the Hebrew, as much as the Chaldee sections of the Bible. As peculiar appears here זי for דר.

2. It is obvious, on the slightest inspection, that the Chaldee, as it exists at present, sustains a very close relation to the *Syriac*, both lexically and grammatically. It possesses, in common with it, all its essential characteristics, but differs from it again in its details, so far as to maintain a certain individuality of its own. These deviations, however, are grammatical rather than lexical, and affect chiefly the vocalization, in which respect the Chaldee resembles the Phoenician and the Hebrew.

On this relation of the Chaldee to the Syriac, see Aurivillius de lingua Aramaea, in his Dissertatt. ed. Michaelis, p. 104 sq.

<sup>1</sup> Jerome terms the language of his original text of the apocrypha sometimes *Hebrew*, sometimes *Chaldee*. This is to be referred, perhaps, to the fact, that some of these compositions connected themselves more decidedly with the ancient Hebrew, while others of them were written in the current language of the people. Yet the two expressions might possibly be synonymous, as a comparison of the passages Commentar. in Matth. Lib. 2 (on 12, 13) and Contra Pelag. 3. 1. renders probable.

A comprehensive survey of the lexical character of the Chaldee would be inappropriate here. Its agreement with the Syriac in reference to the sounds of consonants in such words as belong to the Chaldee in common with the Hebrew, is the only point which need be here remarked. As in this respect the Syriac bears, in general, the character of a flat language, so also in Chaldee **ד** and **ה** often appear in the place of **ז** and **ש**; e. g. **דָּבַח** *to sacrifice*, **דָּהַב** *gold*, **דָּרַע** *seed*, **אָדָן** *ear*, for **אָזָן**, **דָּ** or **דִּי** as relat. from **זָה**, **דָּבַר** *to break in pieces*, **דָּוִר** *steer*, **לָדָה** *lion* (Hebr. לָדָשׁ), **דָּחַדָּה** *new*, for **דָּחַדָּשׁ**, and **ט** instead of **צ**, e. g. **טָוִר** *rock*, **עָצָא** *counsel*. Less frequently **ש** is changed into **ט**, and **צ** into **ע**, e. g. **קָטַר** *to bind*, for **קָשַׁר**, **אָרֶע** *earth*, for **אָרֶץ**. That the *literae unius organi* are interchanged, scarcely needs to be remarked; e. g. **כָּבָרִית** *brimstone*, **קֹיבַע** *helmet*, **בָּנַס** *to collect*, **זָעִיר**, **וְחֵלִי** *small*.

The Chaldee shares with the Syriac, *grammatically*, the following properties: 1. The forms of the words are in general pronounced with fewer vowels than in Hebrew, and consequently the consonants predominate here in the grammatical structure; e. g. **קָטַר**, **מָלְךָ**, **קָטִיר**. 2. The *Stat. emphat.* instead of the article employed in Hebrew and Arabic. 3. The **ד** as sign of the Gen. and the **ל** as sign of the Accus. as well as **דִּי** as the sign of relation. 4. The termination **-ין** for the *Plur.* of the *Masc.* 5. The distinction of the third *Plur. Pract.* in the *Masc.* and *Fem.* 6. The formation of Reflexives and Passives by the prefixed syllable **אָת**. 7. The formation of the third conjugation in such a form as **אָקַטַל**. 8. The use of Imperatives Passive. 9. Double Participles in the Actives of the second and third conjugation. 10. The formation of a special Tense by the use of the Partic. in connection with pronouns. 11. The preference of **א** instead of **ה** at the end of words; e. g. **מְלָכָא** *queen*, and the interchange arising thence of verbs **לָא** and **לָה**. 12. The pleonastic use of the suffixes before the Genitive. 13. The use of the third Plur. of the Actives in a Passive signification. 14. The formation of an adjective personal pronoun by means of **דִּי** with a suffix; e. g. **דִּיִּלִּי** *meus*, **דִּיִּלְךָ** *tuus*.

On the peculiarities of the Chaldee which distinguish it from the Syriac (with a nearer approach, sometimes, to the Hebrew), see Fr. Dietrich *de sermonis Chald. proprietate*. Lips. 1839. 8. Briefly considered, they are principally the following: 1. A preference for clearer vowels, since *a* is often employed instead of the Syr. and

Hebr. *o*; e. g. כָּתַב Syr. ܟܬܒ, אָלַח Syr. ܐܠܚ, Hebr. אָלַח, עָלַם Hebr. עוֹלָם, אָנַשׁ Hebr. אֲנִישׁ, קָל Hebr. קוֹל, קָרָא ; besides, *a* is used in Chaldee instead of the Syriac *u*, in the termination of the Infin. out of Peal; also often *i*, where in Syriac *u* occurs; e. g. כָּל, ܡܠܝ, and ܐ where the vowel, in Syriac, is ܐ--;

e. g. ܩܪܝܢ, ܡܠܝܢ, further, the plural ending of the Fem. ܝܢ instead of ܝܢ, and ܝܢ instead of ܝܢ; the compos. Sheva under gutturals we could not with certainty reckon here, since the Syrians, although without written signs, may in a similar manner have uttered a short half-vowel under the vowelless gutturals.

2. The avoiding of diphthongs; comp. ܝܪܝܬ with ܡܠܝܬ, ܡܠܝܬ *St. constr.* with ܡܠܝܬ, ܐܘܝܠܝܬ with ܐܠܝܬ, ܡܠܝܬ with ܡܠܝܬ, as well as of the *literae otiantes*; comp. ܡܠܝܬ *my king*, ܡܠܝܬ, ܡܠܝܬ, ܡܠܝܬ.

3. The regular accentuation of the last syllable; e. g. ܡܠܝܬܐ. 4. The prevailing formation of the Inf. except Peal without the prefixed ܐ. 5. The retaining of ܐ as Preform. of the third Fut. in place of ܐ which prevails in Syriac; only the Targ. Prov. (and the Talm.) have appropriated to themselves the ܐ (contrary to Fürst, who explains away this peculiarity, p. 9 sq.; see Dietrich as already cited, p. 42 sq.). Further, the forms of the suffixes with epenth. ܐ are very frequent in Chaldee, but occur rarely in Syriac. In respect to orthography, the more constant occurrence of the *scriptio plena* should be likewise mentioned, and the existence of a written sign (Dag. forte) to denote the doubling of the consonants that are not gutturals; comp. Hoffmann, Grammat. Syr. p. 105 sq.

3. Accordingly, the Chaldee may be denominated, with entire propriety, an *Aramaean* dialect; and so, in fact, it is termed in the Bible itself (Dan. 2: 4. Ezra 4: 7). Its proper native country is Babylonia; for in the Jewish tradition, Dan. 2: 4, this language is represented as there in its home; and because, too, in this way may be explained the fact that the Jews, who lived a long time as exiles in Babylon and its provinces, appropriated to themselves this idiom, both as their



written and spoken language. If this view be correct, it would be then not inappropriate to distinguish a *West Aramaean* and an *East Aramaean*, and to apply the term *Babylonish* to what has hitherto been called the Chaldee dialect.

The *Aramaean*, אַרַמִּי, is the language generally which was spoken in the various countries designated in the Old Testament by the term אַרַם (See Gesen. Thesaur. I. p. 151. Winer's R.w. I. 92 sq.). That appellation occurs in the Old Testament four times, 2 Kings 18: 26. Isa. 36: 11. Ezra 4: 7. Dan. 2: 4. In the first two passages, the Assyrian officers (Sennacherib's) are requested by the Hebrew courtiers to speak in Aramaean, as being a dialect which was not intelligible to the common Israelites. The Assyrian language itself, a Median dialect, is certainly not meant here (this could not be called Aramaean; nor was it, at that time, familiar to the Hebrew statesmen); but the language which was used in that portion of Aram subject to the Assyrian dominion, and which also could not be unknown to the officers of the Assyrian court. See Gesen. commentar zu Jesaias I. 946 sq. In Ezra 4: 7, the term *Aramaean* is applied to a letter which the authorities of the Persian government, in the country on this side of the Euphrates, send to the king, and which, accordingly, is inserted in the Chaldee language. Finally, in the passage of Daniel already cited, the Chaldee interpreters of dreams speak with Nebuchadnezzar in *Aramaean*, i. e. as the sequel shows, in the language of which we here treat. Philologists have now accustomed themselves to apply the term *Aramaean* generally to the language of the Semites who dwelt in Syria, Mesopotamia and Babylonia; according to which, the Syriac is an Aramaean dialect, and our Chaldee, so called, claims also this appellation, because, in its essential character, it allies itself so closely to the Syriac. But scholars until very recently, on the grounds above alluded to, sought the proper home of *this* Aram. dialect in Babylonia, consequently in East Aram; and they could, therefore, distinguish the Chaldee, as East Aramaean, from the Syriac as West Aramaean; although East Aramaean is a wider appellation and strictly comprehends also the Mesopotamian. (Comp. also Gesenius, Gesch. der Hebr. Spr. 6. and in the Encyclopädie of Ersch and Gruber, I. Sect. XVI. 109 sq. Hoffmann, Grammat. Syr. p. 3). See, in general, J. A. M. Nagel de lingua Aramaea. Altorf. 1739. 4. Adelung, Mithridates I. 327 sq.

This East Aramaean might now be denominated *Babylonish* (as

in Ezra 4: 9 the inhabitants of Babylonia are called *בְּבִלְיָא*). But since in the Old Testament the people of Babylonia are uniformly termed *בְּשָׁדִירִים*, and in Dan. 1: 4 mention is made of a *לְשׁוֹן בְּשָׁדִירִים* (at the court of Nebuchadnezzar), the designation *Chaldee* has been preferred. It is indeed very doubtful, however, whether the *בְּשָׁדִירִים* were the original inhabitants of Babylonia, and even whether they were Semites in general: the former, because the Greeks, in the time of the Persian kingdom, show themselves still acquainted with *Χαλδαῖοι*, as a people who lived in the mountainous parts of Armenia (Winer, *Rw. I.*, 254); the latter, because the Chaldee proper names and titles of office (of the period of Nebuchadnezzar and his successors) find their explanation, for the most part, not in the Semitic, but the Medo-Persian language (Nagel de lingua Aramaea, p. 5 sq. Gesenius, *Gesch. der Hebr. Sprache*, 62 sq.).<sup>1</sup> On this account many have been disposed to regard the Chaldeans as a nation that migrated into Babylonia and became subsequently masters of it, and who are, therefore, distinct from the proper Semitic Babylonians (Gesenius, *Commentar über Jesaias I.* 744 sq. Heeren *Ideen I, II.* 165 sq. Hitzig, *Prophet Jes.* 287, and others). According to this view two different languages, as regards their derivation, would have been spoken in Babylonia, the Chaldee (especially as the language of the court in Babylon itself, comp. Dan. 1: 4) and the (Semitic) Babylonish. The objections which have been alleged hitherto against this ethnographic representation, are of little importance;<sup>2</sup> but they need not be subjected to any examination here, since the question does not affect in any way the subject of Chaldee grammar.

In respect to the manner in which the Jews appropriated to themselves the Chaldee during the Babylonian exile, and afterwards transplanted it to Palestine, see Gesenius, *Gesch. der Hebr. Spr.* p. 25. It exerted a manifest influence upon the Hebrew even as a written language; comp. Hirzel de *Chaldaismi bibl. origine et auctoritate critica.* Lips. 1830. 4. Still the Jews termed this

<sup>1</sup> The explanations hitherto given (by Lorsbach, *Archiv. f. bibl. und morgenl. Literat.* II. 246 ff. und von Bohlen, *Symbolae ad interpret. sacri cod. e lingua Pers.* Lips. 1823. 4.) are not indeed placed beyond all doubt; nay, they are in part entirely unsuccessful. Comp. Kleinert, in the *Dörpt. Beiträg. zu den theol. Wissensch.* I. 213 sq. Hävernicks, *Einl. I.* 1. 101 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. P. Schleyer, *Würdigung der Einwurfe gegen die Weissag. an dem Orakel des Jesaia über den Untergang Babels*, C. 13—14, 23 sq. Rottenburg, 1835; then, Freiburg, 1839. 8.



adopted dialect in opposition to the old Hebrew לשון דעבר הנחר. See Lightfoot, *Hor. ad Jo.* 5. 1.

4. Since this dialect, however, has been preserved to us only in writings of Jewish authorship, one could hardly assume that we have it before us in all the purity with which it was spoken by the Semitic Babylonians. Yet in reality, when strictly and impartially considered; it seems to have been influenced by the Hebrew only in some unimportant particulars, while in all that is essential in respect either to its grammatical structure or its stock of words, it retained firmly its Aramaean character.

The assertion that the Chaldee idiom is contained only in writings of Jewish origin, is not invalidated by the fact, that according to Gesenius (*Monum. Phœnic.* I, 232) the inscription on the Carpentras stone is said to have had for its author a heathen Aramaean. For, in the first place, this conjecture is merely a conjecture; and in the second place, as Gesenius thinks, a Hebraizing Aramaean might, through the influence of the neighboring Phœnician, have formed itself even in Syria.

That the Babylonian dialect should approximate somewhat towards the Hebrew in the hands of Jews, especially those of Palestine, was natural in itself, and has been already intimated above in No. 1. But there is no just warrant for the assertion that our present Chaldee, which has come down to us merely through the medium of Jews, was corrupted by them in an extraordinary degree, or was even a dialect first formed by a mixture of the Hebrew and Aramaean (Syriac). See Michaelis, *Abh. v. der Syr. Spr.* 36 sq. Wahl, *Gesch. der Morgenl. Sprachen* p. 291 sq. (whom de Wette has followed, *Einl. ins A. T.* § 22) and formerly Löscher *de causis ling. Hebr.* p. 46. For, from a comparison of the Chaldee (especially as it is found in the older Targums) with the Syriac, as we are acquainted with it from native writers, it is manifest that the Chaldee shares with the Syriac all its main (characteristic) peculiarities of grammatical structure and syntactical arrangement, as well as the greatest part of its stock of words, i. e. its vocabulary—traits sufficiently marked evidently to attest its character as an Aramaean dialect. On the contrary, the Chaldee contains little which coincides with the Hebrew, at the same time that it differs from the Syr-

iac, and this little restricts itself almost solely to the orthography and vocalization. But why might not this, as well as that in the Chaldee, which deviates from the Syriac without agreeing with the Hebrew, be considered as a dialectic variety? Various considerations favor such a view. It is but natural that the Aramaean which occupied so great a territory, like other languages extensively diffused, should have branched out into subordinate dialects, especially if the tribes that spoke it formed separate and remote states, and reached different degrees of culture. Even the Phoenician and Hebrew, notwithstanding the original relationship and the geographical vicinity of these tribes, and the similarity of the natural features of the countries inhabited by them, were distinguished by differences. See Gesenius, *Monum. Phoenic.* II, 335 sq. 439. Again, on the other supposition, it would not be easy to see why the Jews should have divested the Chaldee of its Aramaean character only in some few points, and these such as do not depart further from the Hebrew, than others which they left untouched. It could not be explained why they should have said, e. g. יִקְטֹל instead of יִקְטֹל, אִתְּךָ instead of אִתְּךָ, which last forms are certainly not more foreign to their language than מְלִכִּים instead of מְלִכִּים, יִקְטֹל instead of יִקְטֹל, or מְלִכִּים instead of מְלִכִּים. Besides, a part of the deviations of the Chaldee from the Syriac might be placed to the account of the later Jews, who transferred the vowel-signs to the Chaldee, had not the same pronunciation of Chaldee words (even to that of the Sheva compos.) been already expressed in the New Testament; comp. John 19: 13 γαββαθᾶ גַּבְבְּהָא, Acts 1: 19 Ἀκελδαμά דְּמָא דְּהַקֵּל, Acts 9: 36 Ταβιθά דְּבִרְהָא, 1 Cor. 16: 22 Μαράν ἀθά דְּמָא דְּהַקֵּל, Mark 5: 41 ταλιθά κοῦμι קוּמִי קוּמִי; (so also in Josephus, Ἀδωμά דְּמָא דְּהַקֵּל, Ἀββᾶ אַבְבָּא, etc.)

Finally, also, it is not to be overlooked, that while the Syriac, in accordance entirely with its character as the language of a mountainous region, fell roughly and heavily upon the ear, the Chaldee possessed clearer and smoother sounds, precisely as we might expect from a dialect which was spoken in an open, flat and level country. In many of the ancient writers, particularly among the Greeks, a Syrian and Babylonian language is the same—they recognize no distinction between them (Hupfeld, as already cited, 292); but no one who considers the superficial acquaintance which they had with everything relating to the oriental philology, will regard this as any argument against the position which has been advanced; and

so much the less, when he adds to this that the term *Syriac*, as used among the ancients, was fully as extensive in its meaning as the term *Aramaean*. But it must not be supposed, because we find the dialect here spoken of only in writings composed by Jews, that this dialect was, therefore, formed by the Jews; we have, in general, no written monuments from Babylonian hands. The destruction, however, of the Babylonian literature, if any such ever existed, is not more difficult to be explained than that of the literary works of Phoenicia or Carthage. In short, the circumstance that in the Gemara the current Jewish language of Palestine is called *Syriac*, is fully outweighed by the fact, that in the Mishna (Schekal. 5, 3) the same is styled *Aramaean*; the term in fact, according to Hupfeld (p. 291), which is said to be the Talmudic designation of the Babl. Arm. language. (The Talmud recognizes, therefore, such a language? This is an important concession; for what Hupfeld remarks, p. 293, could only be assumed.)

Nor will any one, with Fürst (Lehrgebäude der Aram. Idiome, p. 5), consider the idiom in question as a Syriac language adopted by the Jews, and deny altogether a dialectic difference between the Syriac and the Babylonish. What is remarked by this scholar, p. 7 sq., in order to remove every deviation of the Chaldee, so called, from the Syriac, is in part incomplete, as an exhibition of the phenomena in the case; in part, founded upon attempts to identify the two dialects, which do not prove tenable on closer examination. Comp. Dietrich de sermonis Chal. proprietate. Lips. 1839. 8. p. 10. 43. One cannot but characterize it as a weak argument, that in the Old Testament allusion is made only to the Aramaean in a general way, but never to a double dialect of this language, and that the Talmudists term our idiom סורסי! Fürst acknowledges, however (p. 13), a *pure* Aramaean in the language of the Paraphrases, and will admit only such a difference between this language and the Syriac (transmitted to us only in Christian writings) as was produced by religious faith; so that, according to this view, we must divide the Aramaean, not into West and East Aramaean, but Jewish and Christian Aramaean. An assertion like this, however, it would be found difficult to sustain, especially when it should be first shown how Judaism and Christianity could have operated upon the *grammatical* structure of the Aramaean. The dialectic deviations of the Chaldee from the Syriac are greater, at all events, than the differences between the Phoenician and Car-



thaginian; although this latter is precisely a case, in which we should expect a different relation (Gesenius, *Monum. Phoenic.* II, 337). Finally, we can argue nothing decisive from the language of the Carpentras inscription, which is said, according to Gesenius, to belong to some heathen Aramaean, who was a native of Phoenicia. Even supposing the truth of this conjecture, it is of too limited extent to admit of comparison with the Chaldee idiom, the remains of which are so much more ample, in order to prove that the Aramaean might have formed itself among the Jews into the Chaldee, as it is called, as easily as that dialect arose from a combination of the Aramaean with Phoenician elements.

The periods of Persian and Greco-Macedonian supremacy introduced Persian and Grecian words into the Babylonish (yet fewer than into the Syriac, upon which the ecclesiastical Greek of the Christian fathers operated); hence even the Targum of Onkelos and the bibl. Chaldee (comp. e. g. Dan. 4: 5, 7) is not free from Greek words; (comp. D. Cohen de Lara de convenientia vocabul. Rabbin. (et Chald.) c. Graecis cet. Amst. 1648. 4). But the Saracen power, which swept over Babylon with the army of the Caliphs, 640 after Christ, extirpated utterly the Aramaean dialect in all its branches, so that no trace of it remains at the present time in the East; for the report that the Chaldee is still spoken in some villages near Mosul and Mardin (Niebuhr, *Reise* II, 363), is destitute of all probability, and has not been confirmed by recent travellers.<sup>1</sup> Another statement, which is still more unsupported, see in Eichhorn's *Biblioth.* VIII. p. 435.

---

*The most important helps for the acquisition of the Chaldee are the following :*

#### 1. LEXICONS.

- J. Buxtorfii the elder (1629),<sup>2</sup> *Lexicon Chaldaico-Talmudico-Rabbinicum.* Basl. 1640. Fol.  
 Edm. Castelli *Lexicon heptaglotton.* Lond. 1669. Fol. (which contains also a complete Chald. Vocabulary).  
 M. J. Landau, rabb. aram. deutsch. *Wörterbuch zur Kenntniss des Talm., der Targum. etc.* Prag. 1819. 20.  
 J. H. Dessauer, *Gedrängtes vollständiges aram. chald. deutsches Handwörterbuch.* Erlang. 1838. 8.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix, No. 3.—Tr.

<sup>2</sup> The year designated in these cases is that of the author's death.—Tr.

## 2. GRAMMARS.

a) Of the Semitic dialects generally, or at least of the Aramaean dialect.

- J. Buxtorf, *Grammatica Chald. et Syr.* Basil. (1615.) 1650. 8.  
 Lud. de Dieu (1642), *Grammatica linguar. orientall. Hebr. Chald. et Syr. inter se collatarum.* L. B. 1628. 4. Fref. a. M. 1683. 4.  
 J. H. Hottinger (1667), *Grammatica quatuor linguar. Hebr. Chald. Syr. et Arab. Tigur.* 1849. 4. Heidelb. 1658.  
 Andr. Sennert (1689), *Hypotyposis harmonica linguar. orientall. Chald. Syr. et Arab. c. matre Hebr. Viteb.* 1553. 4.  
 Car. Schaaf (1729), *Opus Aramaeum compl. Grammaticam Chald. Syr. etc.* L. Bat. 1686. 8.  
 Ign. Fessler, *Institutt. linguar. orientall. Hebr. Chald. Syr. et Arab.* Vra-tisl. 1787. 89. 2 Tomi. 8.  
 J. Gottfr. Hasse (1806), *prakt. Handb. der aram. Sprache.* Jena. 1791. 8.  
 — *Elementa Aram. s. Chald. et Syr. linguae Lat. reddita et accessionibus aucta ab Andr. Oberleitner.* Vindob. 1820. 8.  
 J. S. Vater (1826), *Handbuch der hebr. syr. chald. und arab. Grammatik.* Leipzig. (1802.) 1817. 8.

b) The Chaldee language separately.

- Chph. Cellarii (1707), *Chaldaismus s. Grammatica nova ling. Chald. Cizae.* 1685. 4.  
 Henr. Opitii (1712), *Chaldaismus targum Talm. Rabbin. Hebraismo harmonicus.* Kil. 1696. 4.  
 J. Dav. Michaelis (1791), *Grammatica Chald.* Goett. 1771. 8.  
 Wilh. Fr. Hezel. (1824), *Anweis. zum Chald. bei Ermangelung alles mündl. Unterrichts.* Lemgo. 1787. 8. (See Michaelis, *neue oriental. und exeget. Bibl.* V, 180 sq. Eichhorn's *Bibl.* I, 1034).  
 N. W. Schröder (1798), *Institutt. ad fundam. Chaldaismi bibl. brevissime concinnata* (1787) ed. 2. aucta et emend. Ulm. 1810. gr. 8. (An appendix, properly, to this author's grammar. See Eichhorn's *Bibl.* VIII, 694.)  
 Jul. Fürst, *Lehrgebäude der aramäischen Idiome in Bezug auf die indogerman. Sprachen* (I. Thl. *Formenlehre der chald. Grammatik*). Lpz. 1835. 8. (The portion which treats of nouns is not contained in this division of the work.)

## 3. CHRESTOMATHIES AND READERS.

- Geneseos ex Oncelosi paraphr. Chald. quatuor priora capita una c. Dan. c. 2. Chald. ed. W. Fr. Hezel. Lemgo. 1788. 8.  
 Ge. Lor. Bauer (1806), *Chrestom. e paraphras. Chald. et Talmude delecta c. nott. et ind.* Nürnberg. 1792. 8. (See Eichhorn's *Bibl.* IV, 895 sq.)  
 J. Jahn, *chald. Chrestomathie grösstentheils aus Handschriften.* Wien. 1800. (Without a glossary.)  
 H. Adolf Grimm (1815), *chald. Chrestomathie mit einem vollständigen Glossar.* Lemgo. 1801. 8.

Besides, the Chaldee words in Dan. and Ezra are usually admitted into the Hebr. Lexicons. The older Hebrew grammars (see Alting, Danz, etc.) contain also a brief introduction to the Chaldee.



## PART I.

---

### ELEMENTS, OR SIGNS FOR READING, AND THEIR USE.

#### § 1.

#### *Consonants.*

THE Chaldee is written with the same consonants that are employed in Hebrew; and so far as we are able to trace the history of the former, it has never been expressed by any other essentially different mode of representation. On the contrary, the palaeographers have long maintained the view, that the *square letter*, which we now term *Hebrew* by way of eminence, belonged originally to the Chaldeans (Babylonians), and was first adopted by the Jews instead of the old Hebrew character, after the Babylonian exile. This may not admit of being satisfactorily proved; still it is impossible to entertain any doubt of the Aramaean origin of the Hebrew-Chaldee character, in opposition to the old Hebrew (so-called Samaritan) alphabet.

The older view has been defended at large in Gesenius's *Geschichte der hebr. Sprache und Schrift* (Leipzig. 1815. 8) p. 140 sq. [In consequence of more recent discussions respecting this point, Gesenius has expressed himself less decidedly in his later works. See his *Hebr. Gram.* p. 17.—Tr.] This opinion began to be shaken even by Kopp, but was more fully controverted by Hupfeld, in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1830. 2 Heft, with whom Hävernicks agrees essentially, in his *Einl.* p. 288 sq. What they maintain is that the present Hebrew character came to the Jews from the neighboring Syrians, and was afterwards calligraphically improved by them. Its nearest modal form is to be sought in the Palmyrene mode of writing. However, all the arguments which Hupfeld advanced have not equal force, or indeed any true force in some instances: see Winer's *Bibl. Rw.* II, 497 sq. And even if the square letter,

as it lies before us in the Codd., does not extend back beyond the third century after Christ, still the Aramaean character, which it represents, may have been already known to the Jews in the time of the Babylonian exile, and used by them at that period, just as the characters on the Aramaean-Egyptian monuments prove an earlier existence of Aramaean written signs; see *Rw.* as above; Gesenius, *Monum. Phoenic.* I. 78, and also Ewald, *Krit. Grammat. der hebr. Spr.* 11 sq.

That the square letter, as it now appears in the Hebrew and Chaldee manuscripts and printed works, acquired this particular form in the course of time and gradually, may be inferred in part from the nature of the case, in part from an inspection of the oldest MSS., and especially of the *Palmyrene*, and the still more ancient Egyptian-Aramaean monuments. Among the ruins of the Syrian city *Palmyra* or *Thadmor*, travellers have discovered several inscriptions, the oldest of which dates from the year 49 after Christ (see the painting in Wood's *Ruins of Palmyra*, Lond. 1753, and the plate at the end of Tychsen's *Element. Syr. Comp. Kopp, Bilder und Schriften* II, 245 sq.). The characters found upon them agree manifestly, in their main points, with the square figure, but differ from the present Hebrew letters by a rougher and less distinct form; and thus afford proof that our present square alphabet has received this permanent character principally in consequence of calligraphic efforts. Still nearer, in some respects, to the square alphabet, stand the written characters, which, from the circumstance of their having been found upon certain monuments in Egypt, have received the name of *Egyptian-Aramaean*; comp. Gesenius, *Monum. Phoenic.* I, 59 sq. The forms of particular letters (Tab. 4. col. 3. in Gesenius), as כ, ד, כ, ד, exhibit still more decidedly this resemblance to the square character. (On the question how far the Aramaean character, in its most ancient form, goes back to the old Phoenician, and thus may have sprung, at last, from the same root, as well as the old Hebrew, see Gesenius, *Monum. Phoenic.* I, 64.).

## § 2.

### *Vowel Signs.*

The vowel-points, also, and the various diacritic signs (in part even the accents), which are employed in Hebrew, have been extended to the Chaldee, and appear in many manuscripts and most editions of the Chaldee text. Since it is certain, however, that these signs were all invented by the Jews, even as late as

several centuries after Christ, it follows that the written Chaldee was originally without any provision for the representation of the vowels, etc. It may be added, also, that in the Egyptian-Aramaean, as well as the Palmyrene inscriptions, no vowel-signs are perceptible. But proof may be derived from the nature of the Chaldee punctuation itself, that the language previously to this availed itself of the letters א, ו, י, in doubtful cases, as a guide to the reading.

The correctness of this remark is evident from orthographical phenomena like חִיבְּמָא בְּלִשְׁאֲרִי מְלָאָה Dan. 2: 35, etc., and from the frequent use of the *scriptio plena*. See § 4.

2. Since, however, the transfer of the Jewish vowel-signs to the Chaldee took place in an age when the Jewish vowel-system had not yet been perfectly formed and established, and since subsequently the same attention was not devoted to the punctuation of the Chaldee text, particularly that of the Targum, which was given to the biblical Chaldee, we can readily understand why the Chaldee writings exhibit at present so much less regularity in this respect than the Hebrew Scriptures. Not only do the Chaldee Codd. and editions (especially those of Venice and London) differ widely from each other, but there prevails everywhere a great fluctuation in the use of the long and short vowels.

On the variable punctuation of the Targums, see Eichhorn, Einl. ins A. T. 2 Thl. p. 24 sq. The printed copies of the Targums distribute themselves, as regards their punctuation, into three principal classes: 1. The pointed text of Onkelos, contained in the *Complutensian Bible* (1517)—whether derived in this state from MSS. is uncertain. This, with some alterations of Rapheleng, the *Antwerp polyglott* (1569) adopted, and added the Chaldee Paraphrases of most of the Old Testament books. 2. The three Rabbinic Bibles of *Bomberg* (Venice, 1518, 1526, 1547—49. See Rosenmüller's Handb. f. die bibl. Literatur I, 249 sq.) contained the Chaldee text, as it appears, strictly according to Codd. 3. On the contrary, Buxtorf, in his *Rabbin. Bible* (1618), not only altered greatly the paraphrases taken from the Venetian editions in conformity with the Hebrew, but also made the punctuation more regular. This improved text, as it was considered, the *London polyglott* (1657) repeated. Finally, in the *Paris polyglott* (1629 sq.) we have a mixed text presented to us. A careful comparison of all these



impressions is much to be desired, as also that the punctuation in the manuscripts should be more perfectly examined. Valuable in this respect is Jahn's Chaldee Chrestomathy, since according to his assurance he had the sections of Onkelos printed so as to correspond exactly to the Codd. But the punctuation here agrees, in the main, more with that of Buxtorf than that of the Venetian Bibles.

In the Chaldee text, even of the biblical sections, long vowels frequently stand in a closed, unaccented syllable, contrary to the rules of the Masoretic punctuation; and, on the other hand, short vowels occur in a simple syllable. (In particular are ו and י used altogether *promiscuously*, of which in Hebrew an incipient usage only is observable. See Gesenius, *Lehrgebäude*, p. 60.) For the former, comp. instances like חוּרְיָנָה Deut. 23: 16, אִיחְרִינָן Jer. 49: 19, עֲלִין (allin) Dan. 4: 4; for the latter, קַטְלָו, סָקוּ (§ 18). On the contrary, I should not rank examples like שְׁאֲלָתָא Dan. 4: 14, תְּקִילָתָא Dan. 5: 27, כְּטִילָתוֹן etc., under No. 1.; for these words are entirely analogous to the Hebrew דְּבָרָה כְּבוֹדָם; the consonant which follows immediately the long vowel, must be referred to the last syllable, and the anomaly of the orthography consists merely in the omission of the *Methegh*, which is far more negligently employed in the Chaldee, than in Hebr. manuscripts. See Gesenius, *Lehrgebäude*, p. 118.) It appears with most regularity, however, in the Bible; comp. e. g. Dan. 6: 4 רְנַיָאֵל, סְרַבְיָא, 6: 6 אֲמַרְיָן, 6: 17 פְּלַחְיָא, Dan. 2: 8 זַבְבִּינָן, Dan. 4: 31 שְׁלֻמְכֹן, 7: 12 שְׁלֻטְנֵהוֹן.

It results from the preceding, that the rule for *Qamets Hhatuph*, which occurs in Chaldee much less frequently than in Hebrew, will not prove indeed in practice so certain, as there; the reader must observe the origin of words, so as not to pronounce, e. g.. עֲלִין, קַטְלִין qotlin, ollin. On the contrary, examples like הוֹרְכָמָא can occasion no difficulty. A superfluous *mater lectionis* has been here retained (§ 4); and no one would so far err as to think of a quiescent ו in *Qamets Hhatuph*, or even such a pronunciation as *Hhāvkhmā*. The occurrence of ו without Sheva is decisive against the latter. But the Chaldee words which contain a *Qamets Hhatuph* at all, are very few.

### § 3.

#### *Place of the Tone.*

According to the usage of the Masoretic punctuation, transferred from the Hebrew to the Chaldee of Dan., Ezra and Onkelos, the tone, in Chaldee words also, rests uniformly upon the last syllable; it is only as an exception, and in certain forms, that the



tone rests on the penultimate. This last occurs in the following cases: 1. In the Segholate forms of nouns, which resemble those that bear this designation in Hebrew; as *מֶלֶךְ*, *טֶעֶם*, *עֵדֶן*, *אֹרֶחַ*, and the analogous verbal forms, as *שָׁלַחַת*, *אָמְרַת*, as also in the Plural (and Dual) ending *־וֹן*; 2. In the verbal forms terminating in *וֹ* and *נָא*; e. g. *קִטְלָתָא*, *קִטְלָנָא*; in the third Plur. Praeter, as *קִטְלָה*, *קִטְלָא*, *קִטְלָיָא*; in the persons of the Imperative terminations in *־וֹ* and *־וֹי*, as *קִטְלֵי*, *קִטְלֵוֹ*; 3. In the forms of verbs and nouns with the *suffixes* *־נִי*, *־הָא*, *־נָא*, *־הִי*, *־וֹהִי*, *כְּמַחִי*, *מִיגֹוֹהִי*, *מִלְכְּהָא*, *רְגִלְנָא*, *הוֹרְעִתְנִי*, etc.; besides, the *suffixes* *־נִי*, *־כִי*, *־הִי*, leave the tone to the preceding syllable; e. g. *בְּרִכְנִי*.

On exception 2 above, we subjoin a further remark. In the biblical Chaldee the forms *קִטְלָה*, *קִטְלָא* etc., are regularly marked with the tone on the penult; comp. Dan. 6: 7, 25. 7: 4. Ezra 4: 11, 18, 23. 5: 5. 6: 1, 13, 16 sq.; so likewise the Imperatives Dan. 7: 5. Ezra 6: 7. From Onkelos, comp. Gen. 29: 5 sq. 7: 21. Exod. 2: 19; however, these forms are here sometimes accented on the ultimate, even when no pospositive accent (see Gesenius, Gr. p. 41—Tr.) falls upon it; e. g. *אֲמַרְוֹ*, *בְּלִלְנָא* Gen. 3: 7. 26: 28. Exod. 2: 16, 18. The Infinitives in *־וֹ* have the place of the tone on the ultimate with the single exception which is about to be remarked. A drawing back of the tone from the last syllable to the last but one takes place (in bibl. Chaldee, yet without uniformity) when two tone-syllables would follow each other in immediate succession; comp. Ezra 6: 12 *שָׁמַעַתְּ טַעַם*, Dan. 7: 12 *לְהוֹנֵן לְהַיָּבֵת*, Exod. 2: 2, also in pause; e. g. Exod. 8: 12 *לְשַׁלְּחָא*. Besides, in pause a monosyllabic word sometimes became disyllabic with the tone on the penultimate, as Gen. 4: 9. Jon. *אֲנִי*; seldom is the accent carried forward to the last open syllable Gen. 37: 10 *הִלְמִתָּא*, 49: 9 *סָלְקָתָא*, 16: 4 *עֲדִינָא* (Gesenius, Lehrgeb. p. 178). On the effect of the pause in lengthening the vowel of the accented syllable, see § 7 a.

The German and Polish Jews place the tone in Chaldee, as in Hebrew, regularly on the penultimate. That this accentuation, however, was the ancient Babylonian, we could not infer from the accentuation prevalent in Syriac; for two dialects, otherwise very nearly related, might still differ from each other in their accentuation. Were the vocalization of the Chaldee, as it now exists, perfectly conformed to the ancient Babylonian pronunciation, it would afford also an argument for the received accentuation of the Chaldee.

## § 4.

*Reading of Unpointed Text.*

As all Chaldee text is not pointed; and as that which is unpointed, in addition to the ordinary use of the *matres lectioni*, א, ו, י (י for *e* and *i*, ו for *o* and *u*, א for *a*, Sheva vocal also being often designated by י; e. g. אִנְשָׁא for אִנְשָׁא Gen. 2: 5, עִבְדִּירָא for עִבְדִּירָא instead of אִתָּא Genes. 4: 8. Jon., אִמֶּר for אִמֶּר Exod. 6: 6), exhibits several peculiarities, it may be remarked, as a help to the reading of such text, and as applicable also at least to the Targums, that a double ו or י is employed: (a) *In the middle* of words, either where the consonant power of these letters is to be indicated; e. g. מְצוּתָא i. e. מְצוּתָא, הִנְיָנָא i. e. הִנְיָנָא, or where they are to be pronounced twice; e. g. אֲתִדְּנִתָּא i. e. אֲתִדְּנִתָּא, חִיבִינָא i. e. חִיבִינָא; (b) *At the end* of words, particularly where the pronouns י and ו are to be distinguished; e. g. רִגְלִי i. e. רִגְלִי. These helping consonants have been retained in single words, even in the printed text; e. g. Targ. Jon. Gen. 2: 1 אֲוִלָּא instead of אֲוִלָּא, 3: 15 מְצוּתָא, 24: 46 אֲשֶׁקֶייתָא, 25: 21 אֲתִרְוּתָא, Exod. 10: 25 עֲלִוּוֹן, Num. 34: 6 נְוִתִּיָּה, Lev. 13: 38 חִיּוּרָן.

Of the abbreviations which are so numerous in the Rabbins (J. Buxtorf de Abbreviat. Hebr. ed. 2. Basil. 1640. 8.), there occurs constantly in the Targums only יי (יִי) i. e. יְהוָה; on the contrary, in the later Targums several others are found here and there, as Gen. 15: 14. Deut. 32: 31. Jon. עֲבָדִי אֱלִילִים (Buxtorf, p. 150) and Gen. 25: 21. Jon. קבָּה i. e. קוֹדֶשׁא בְּרִיךְ הוּא the *Holy One be praised* (Buxtorf, p. 168). Certain uniform abbreviations appear upon the Jewish coins, as well as the Phoenician inscriptions (Gesenius, Monum. Phoenic. I, 53 sq.

## PART II.

# ETYMOLOGY.

---

### CHAPTER I.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES ON WHICH THE CHANGES OF WORDS DEPEND.

#### § 5.

#### *The Subject in General.*

1. BEFORE it can be shown how the several, permanent parts of speech are produced from one another (*derivari*), and also what changes they undergo within themselves (*declinari*), in order to accomplish the various objects of speech, the fundamental principles must be exhibited, according to which this takes place. The consideration of these principles furnishes the material for that portion of grammar, viz. etymology, or the *general* doctrine of forms, of which we have next to treat. But since in Chaldee, as in every other language, the formation and inflection of words are effected partly by changes in the consonants, partly by changes in the vowels, the subject divides itself naturally into two parts.

2. In considering the modifications, to which the vowels and consonants are subject in the formation and inflection of words, we should distinguish between those which are designed or *rational*, and those which are *physical* or euphonic. Among the former we include those, in which may be traced a fixed, pervading type of formation and inflection, and which is the product of a reflecting consciousness on the part of the people by whom the language is developed. Examples of this are furnished in the



characteristic differences of the Tenses and Conjugations, and in the endings of the Singular and Plural of nouns. As *material* or euphonic, on the contrary, we are to consider those varieties of words, which in the pronunciation of particular forms or combinations are produced, consciously or unconsciously, by the *organs of the speaker*; e.g. קָטְלִין for קָטְלִין, בְּאֶדְיִן for בְּאֶדְיִן, אֶסְתֵּר for אֶסְתֵּר, (in like manner in Latin *imminutus* for *inminutus*, *mi* for *mihi*, *hodie* for *hoc die*, etc.) That the *general* branch of etymology, which grammar embraces, must confine itself principally to changes of the latter kind, is obvious of itself.

### § 6.

#### *Mutations which affect the Consonants.*

The derivation and inflection of words, therefore, are effected in the first place by changes in the *consonants*. In this case, either the radicals which compose the ground-form remain, and other letters with vowels or without them are prefixed, inserted or annexed, or the radicals themselves are rejected, doubled or interchanged with other letters; e.g. קָטְלִין, קָטְלִין, קָטְלִין from קָטַל; נִצָּח from נִצָּח, נִצָּח from נִצָּח. For this purpose the Chaldee employed the letters ו, י, ר, נ, מ, א, ה; and it belongs to *special* etymology to show what use, in each particular instance, was made of these formative letters. *General* etymology, on the other hand, has to notice only certain phonetic changes, i. e. in part such as were produced by the organs of speech entirely without design, in part such as have their origin in the effort of the language to secure to itself softness of pronunciation and euphony. The changes now which take place among consonants, in this way and for this object, are assimilation, transposition, rejection, commutation and addition.

a) *Assimilation* occurs regularly: 1) With נ when it stands without a vowel, at the close of a mixed syllable immediately before another consonant. Thus, instead of יִנְפֵּק we have usually יִנְפֵּק, for מִנְפֵּק, מִנְפֵּק, שִׁנְפֵּק for שִׁנְפֵּק, etc. Genes. 7: 11. Jon. Comp. § 18 in relation to verbs פָּנָה, and § 38. 2) With ת of

the Passive prefix **אֶת** syllable before **ט** and **ד**, more rarely before other letters: see § 10. 5. 3) With **מ** and **ה**, only in particular examples, as **אֶת** for **לוֹ**, **הָמָא**, **הָמָאִי** for **הָמָאִי**, **הָמָאִי** Gen. 1: 6. 6: 16. Jon. 4) With **י** in some verbs **פִּי**; e. g. **יָדַע** instead of **יָדַעַת**, and **אָנִיָּה**, **מָכַל** from **יָנַח** and **יָכַל** (§ 20. 4.). Instead of prolonging the vowel, **י** is here represented by a repetition of the following consonant with a sharpened vowel. Comp. Gesen., Lehrgeb. p. 390 sq.

b) The **ח** of the Passive prefix **אֶת** is regularly *transferred* to the place of the first radical of the verb, when this radical is a sibilant (**ש**, **צ**, **ס**, **ז**); e. g. **אֶתְחַבֵּה**, **אֶתְחַבֵּה**. The easier pronunciation thus obtained is the obvious ground of this usage. Of a lexical character is the transposition which occurs in still other separate examples; as **הָרַע** for **הָרַע** (Hebr. **הָרַע**), **גָּרַז** which coexists with **גָּרַז**.

c) The feeble letters **א**, **י** and **נ**, when destitute of a vowel, are *rejected* (aphaeresis) at the beginning of words; e. g. **יָדַע** for **אֶתְדַע**, **יָדַע** for **אֶתְדַע**, **יָדַע** for **אֶתְדַע**; in the later Targums, also, other consonants; e. g. **דָּבָר** for **אֶתְדָּבָר** Gen. 37: 4. Num. 30: 21. Jon. 2) The same and similar vowelless consonants are dropped in the middle of words, particularly on the contraction of several words into one, or the contact of formative syllables, occasioning the elision of one or more subsequent letters; e. g. **קָטִילָהוֹן** for **קָטִילָהוֹן**, **קָטִילָהוֹן** (§ 13. 1), **הָאֵל** for **הָאֵל**, **הָאֵל** for **הָאֵל**, **הָאֵל** for **הָאֵל** (§ 39, 3. Rem.), **אֶתְדַע** for **אֶתְדַע**, besides, though more rarely, as **יָדַע** Gen. 29: 17 T. H. for **יָדַע**, **יָדַע** for **יָדַע**. This takes place, also, sometimes with **א** and **ה**, when it has a vowel; e. g. **אֶתְדַע** for **אֶתְדַע** (§ 21), **מָכַל** for **מָכַל**. 3) At the end of words the soft **ח** is regularly dropped (apocope) in the Feminine forms of nouns like **מַלְכוּת**; in the later Targums (and in the Talmud) in some other cases, e. g. **בֵּית** for **בֵּית** Gen. 22: 19. 40: 3. Jon. Num. 16: 16. Jon. **חַיִּים** for **חַיִּים** Gen. 26: 21. Jon. The apocope of **ן** appears only in single instances, particularly; e. g. **יָמֵינוּ** for **יָמֵינוּ** Dan. 5: 10; of **ר** in the Fut. **הָאֵל** instead of **הָאֵל** Gen. 33:

10. Jon. ; of מ in קָאִי (קָאִי) for קָאִי Gen. 18: 10. 24: 13. Jon.  
Comp. § 23. Rem. 1.

Merely orthographic is the omission of the quiescent letters; as, חזרי for חזארי, ילד for יללד, מלך for מללך (מלמלך).

d) *Commutation* takes place among those consonants which are similar in their pronunciation, particularly the quiescents ; e. g. מִיבֵּד for מֵאבֵּד, גִּלִּי for גִּלָּא.

On the contrary, it is to be differently explained, when in verbs לָא a movable ך appears in many forms in the place of א, or when קָדְמִיָּהּ is written instead of קִדְמִיָּהּ. In these cases the original consonant which had been displaced, merely returns.

e) A *prosthetic* א is sometimes prefixed to forms which would commence with two consonants; e. g. אֶשְׁתִּי, אָבִיר. See § 23. Rem. 1. This extends lexically, however, still further, and the א prefixed in the formation of Nouns is sometimes nothing else than a prosthetic א; e. g. אֶשְׁרָה, אָרַם, even with a doubling of the subsequent consonant אָרַם, אָנֹן together with אָנֹךָ, אָנֹךָ together with יָד.

To foreign words, especially Greek, which begin with three or two consonants, an א is usually prefixed on their adoption in Chaldee (Talmud); e. g. אַקסִיל Cant. 4: 14. i. e. ὕψλον, אַזְמֵל σμίλη, אַסְטָל στίλη, אַסְטָר strata.

2) By insertion (epenthesis) a liquid and hence softer נ is introduced, sometimes for the purpose of obviating the harsh repetition of a letter; as, אַנְבָּא for אַבָּא, מְנֶדָּה for מִדָּה, יִנְדֵּעַ for יָדַע; (this is especially frequent in the Zabian dialect<sup>1</sup>); sometimes, as a means of union between the sufformative and the verb; as, יִקְטַלְנָהּ for יִקְטַלָּהּ (§ 16. Rem. 1.). For the former object ר also is sometimes employed; comp. דִּמְשִׁיק for דִּרְמִשִּׁק, כִּרְסָא (כִּסֵּא).

On an insertion of ר and ל for the formation of quadrilateral verbs,  
see § 14. 2.

3) To such forms as have a vowel for their final letter, נ (Nun paragoric) is frequently annexed, as furnishing a better termination; e. g. שְׂמֵעוֹן, קָטְלוֹן.

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix, No. 4.—TR.



## § 7.

*Mutations which affect the Vowels.*

The formation and inflection of words, in the second place, are effected by means of vowels; since, in many cases, the characteristic difference between a ground-form and its derivatives consists merely in a change of the vowels; e. g. קָטַל from קָטַל, קָטַל from קָטַל, קָטַל from קָטַל. It cannot be shown indeed, in each particular instance, why precisely these and no other vowels were selected for marking this distinction; but we can at least perceive a certain fixed type, which controls these formations; and this, again, it is the province of special etymology to point out. On the other hand, it belongs to general etymology to bring together and briefly explain certain deviations from this type, and various modifications of the vowels, which have been occasioned by the organs of speech in pronunciation. Vowels, in the course of formation and inflection, are *commuted, transposed, rejected or assumed*.

a) 1. Long vowels are exchanged for a short one, when a closed syllable loses the tone; e. g. קָטַל from קָטַל, Ezra 7: 20 for קָטַל, Dan. 2: 16 for קָטַל, Gen. 30: 31 for קָטַל, Ezra 6: 12 for קָטַל; comp. above § 3, because the tone here is drawn back upon the first syllable; קָטַל Dan. 3: 14, קָטַל Gen. 20: 5. A word is sometimes increased, while the long vowel remains unchanged; but in this case, either the vowel was a *vocalis impura* (e. g. קָטַל), or the final consonant of the word attached itself to the syllable annexed; e. g. קָטַל Dan. 3: 31, as is constantly done in Hebrew קָטַל. See above, § 2. 2. But before Maqqeph the shortening of the vowel is not regularly observed, even in biblical Chaldee; (e. g. Dan. 6: 12 קָטַל, Deut. 2: 28 קָטַל, 7: 11 קָטַל). 2. Short vowels are exchanged for long ones very frequently at the end of sentences where the voice falls (in pause): e. g. קָטַל Gen. 4: 11, קָטַל Dan. 2: 32, קָטַל Dan. 4: 6, קָטַל Gen. 34: 4, קָטַל Gen. 34: 22, קָטַל Exod.

2: 2, אֶחָדָה Gen. 20: 16, כְּנָעַן Gen. 24: 19, מִשְׁלָח Exod. 4: 13, חֲשִׁלָה Gen. 38: 17, מִדְעָם Gen. 30: 31; (yet this is not universal); comp. Dan. 2: 9, 17. Exod. 8: 16;<sup>1</sup> further, before a Guttural which would regularly have been doubled: מִבְרָה for מִבְרָה, מִאֲרָעָה for מִאֲרָעָה, (yet this does not always occur, especially when the Guttural is ה or ח, Dan. 4: 16, 24); less often before other consonants, e. g. חֲנוּן for חֲנוּן Gen. 6: 2. Jon., אֶקְרוֹן for אֶקְרוֹן Gen. 38: 9. Jon.; see § 20. 4); also שִׁיזִיב for שִׁיזִיב (§ 14. 1); again, when a Quiescent which should have a composite Sheva, coalesces with the preceding vowel, e. g. לְאֲדִין for לְאֲדִין, בְּאֶלְהָהּ for בְּאֶלְהָהּ Dan. 6: 24, דְּאֶלְהָכוֹן for דְּאֶלְהָכוֹן Joel 1: 13 (יֶאֱבֵד for יֶאֱבֵד); and finally where, by elision, a short vowel would stand in the open syllable; as, יֶאֱבֵד instead of יֶאֱבֵד, יֶאֱבֵד (§ 6. c.). 3. It is for the sake of greater ease of pronunciation, that final syllables which close with a Guttural, have commonly – instead of what would otherwise be the proper vowel; e. g. רִשְׁלָה for רִשְׁלָה, שִׁבָּה for שִׁבָּה, and also that a heterogeneous vowel in a syllable which terminates with a Quiescent, is exchanged for one homogeneous with the latter: אֶסְרִיהָ for אֶסְרִיהָ.

The case, in which a short vowel passes into a long one in a syllable which has become *simple*, cannot be adduced here; since in most examples the short vowel has been retained by the punctuators, and forms, like שִׁמְעִי, בְּקָרִי are found only here and there in particular editions.

b) Vowels are *transposed*, partly in some monosyllabic forms of verbs, which have the vowel between the last two consonants; namely, when a *Pronoun* is added to them: קָטַל from קָטַל; partly in cases, like מִאֲסִי for מִאֲסִי, where the vowel of the quiescent falls back to the consonant before it, and thus stands in a situation to admit of quiescence.

c) Vowels are *rejected*, in the last syllable of words, when additions are made to them in the process of formation, which do not constitute a syllable by themselves, yet far less frequently than in Hebrew; e. g. עֲלָמָה from עֲלָם, קָטַל from קָטַל, פְּרוֹזָה

<sup>1</sup> The reverse sometimes takes place in connection with a conjunctive accent; comp. Dan. 2: 16, 32. 3: 14. Ezra 4: 19.

from פִּרְזֵל, יִקְטְלוּ from יִקְטֵל. This takes place oftenest with ה, י, ו, ע, א.

d) Finally, vowels are *assumed*: 1) When at the beginning of a syllable two vowelless consonants would follow each other in succession; e. g. יִקְטֵל from קֵטֵל, מִלְכָּה from מֵלְכָה. In such a case, - is commonly inserted as a helping vowel (in which a vowelless ה then quiesces; e. g. דִּיהֶב from דִּיהֵב, דִּיהֶכֶן from דִּיהֵכֶן. If, however, the following consonant be a guttural with a composite Sheva, the consonant which is to receive the vowel takes then a short vowel, corresponding to that of the Sheva; e. g. לָאָסֶר; here, also, belong cases, like תִּעֲבֹדוּן Ezra 7: 18 instead of תִּעֲבֹדוּן (yet at the same time תִּעֲבֹדוּן), יִהְיוּן for יִהְיוּ, הִתְחַרְבֵּת Ezra 4: 15 for הִתְחַרְבֵּת. 2) Sometimes in pause, Gen. 4: 9. יִנָּא instead of יִנָּא Gen. 46: 30. Onk.

REM. In the last two §§, some particular cases of contraction, and especially of the uniting of two independent words into one, have been adduced, as מִנִּי for מִן הִי, הִרִי עָסֶר for הִרִי עָסֶר. This tendency goes much further still in the Talmudic Chaldee, and even the later Targums present examples of very violent contractions, i. e. of such as are not confined to the absorption of single consonants or vowels; as, Lev. 16: 21. יִנָּא for יִנָּא (with א prosthetic), Gen. 19: 34 מִיּוֹמָהָ for מִיּוֹמָהָ. The לָא אִית instead of לָא אִית has become general.

## CHAPTER II.

### The Pronoun.

#### § 8.

#### *Personal and Possessive Pronouns.*

1. The Personal Pronouns are divided, as in Hebrew, into two principal classes. One class consists of those which exist separately, monosyllabic or dissyllabic words (*Pronomina separata*); the other consists of forms abbreviated from these, which



are annexed to verbs and nouns (*Pronomina suffixa*). The former express, with few exceptions, the Personal pronouns in the *casus rectus*; the latter, in the *casibus obliquis*. The *Pronom. separata*, are the following:

	Sing.			Plur.	
1 com.	אֲנִי (אָנָה)	I.	com.	אֲנִי, אַתָּה, הֵם	we.
2 com.	אַתָּה, אַתָּה (אָנָה)	thou.	{ m.	אַתָּה, אַתָּה	} ye.
			{ f.	אַתָּה, אַתָּה	
3 { m.	הוּא (הוּ)	he.	{ m.	הֵם (הֵם)	} they.
{ f.	הִיא	she.	{ f.	הֵן (הֵן)	

הוּא and הִיא occur only in the bibl. Chaldee, the former Dan. 2: 34 sq. 3: 22; the latter, Ezra 4: 10. 5: 5. 7: 17 sq.; הוּא is found Prov. 25: 20.

The *Suffixes* (inseparabilia) are attached to verbs, the signs of the cases (§ 56), and to prepositions and nouns. In the last case, they are translated in English and Latin by possessive pronouns, but they express most directly the Genitive of the personal pronouns, precisely like the mode of speaking in Greek, as in *πατὴρ μου*, *ἡμῶν*, etc.

The *Suffixes to Verbs* are the following:

	Sing.			Plur.	
1 com.	אֲנִי, אַתָּה	me.	(אֲנִי, אַתָּה)	אֲנִי, אַתָּה, הֵם	us.
2 { m.	אַתָּה, אַתָּה	thee.	{	אַתָּה	} you.
{ f.	אַתָּה (אַתָּה), אַתָּה			אַתָּה	
3 { m.	הוּא (הוּ)	him.	{	הֵם, הֵם	} them.
{ f.	הִיא			הֵן, הֵן	
{ f.	הִיא (הִיא)	her.		הֵן, הֵן, הֵן	

Which of these forms should be used in each particular instance, will be stated in § 16, where also will be explained the nature and use of the *Nun epenthetic*, so called, which is often inserted between the verbal form and the suffix, and which modifies to some extent the forms of the suffixes. To deny this altogether is useless; though no doubt a נ has been sometimes considered as epenthetic, which belongs to the suffix or the verbal form itself, as in *קָטְלִינִי* or even *קָטְלִינִי*.

3. The *Suffixes to Nouns*, again, divide themselves into *two* classes, according as they are attached to nouns in the Singular, or nouns in the Plural (and which express, consequently, the possessive pronouns in the Sing. or the Plur. *meus, mei; noster, nostri*, etc.). The latter are distinguished for the most part by their longer forms, in which the *v* of the plural termination may be discerned. They are in general the following :

### 1. *Suffixes to Nouns Singular.*

Sing.			Plur.			
1	com.	אֲנִי	my.	com.	אֲנֵנוּ	our.
2	m.	אַתָּה	} thy.	m.	כּוֹם, כּוֹן	} your.
	f.	אַתְּ (אֲתָּה)		f.	כֶּן	
3	m.	הוּא	} his.	m.	הוּם, הוֹן	} their.
	f.	הִיא		f.	הֵינּוּ	

אֲ is found twice instead of אֵ Dan. 4: 15, 16. 5: 8; but sometimes in the Targums וְהִי Gen. 1: 12, 21; very often *plene* וְהִיא Num. 24: 7. For כֹּהֵן and הֹוֹהֵן we very frequently find יִכֹּהֵן and יִהוֹהֵן in the Venetian copies Ps. 149: 2. Joel 2: 23 הוֹהֵם occurs; e. g. Gen. 9: 23. 10: 5, 22: 6. 40: 3. Jon., כֹּהֵם Gen. 17: 12. Jon.; this was also the Phœnician pronunciation. In connection with the words אֶבֶן, אֶבֶן and הֶבֶן, which before the suffixes become אֶבֶןִי etc., the suffixes of the second and third Pers. Sing. appear in the form הָ, הִי, הָא (הָ); the last of which occurs also elsewhere as a noun-suffix; e. g. בְּנֵהָא Gen. 3: 5; וְשִׁפְרָהָא Esth. 1: 12.

These Suffix-forms are also attached to the prepositions ל, ב, מן, לְיָהּ, as well as to the sign of the accusative; e. g. לְיָהּ לְיָהּ (לְיָהּ Gen. 3: 2. Jon.) לְיָהּ, לְיָהּ, לְיָהּ.

## 2. *Suffixes to Nouns Plural.*

Sing.			Plur.		
1	<i>com.</i>	my.	<i>com.</i>		our.
2	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} m. \\ f. \end{array} \right.$	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \\ \end{array} \right.$ thy.	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} m. \\ f. \end{array} \right.$	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \\ \end{array} \right.$	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \\ \end{array} \right.$ your.
3	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} m. \\ f. \end{array} \right.$	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \\ \end{array} \right.$ his. her.	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} m. \\ f. \end{array} \right.$	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \\ \end{array} \right.$	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \\ \end{array} \right.$ their.

These plural suffixes are regularly attached only to Masculine nouns (from the plural termination of which also the ך in the second person *Sing.* and in the *Plur.* is derived); on the contrary, Feminine nouns receive fully as often the singular suffixes ך, ךָ, etc. Gen. 20: 17. Dan. 5: 2. 2: 23, 32. Ezra 4: 17. 6: 18. Isa. 1: 4. 17: 21. 64: 5. Prov. 1: 18. Gen. 47: 9), since the representative of the plural idea already exists here in the termination ך. In Syriac this always takes place; and the Chaldee, therefore, occupies in this respect strictly a middle position between the Hebrew and the Syriac.

The suffix ך is written in some editions ך or ך ( § 4.), often also it appears in the abbreviated form ך Dan. 5: 10. 2 Sam. 11: 8, 24. Ps. 119: 4. So likewise in some editions instead of the *Fem.* ך we find the form ך, so that the two genders are no longer distinguished, Isa. 49: 18, 23, *Venet.* The third Pers. sing. fem. makes ך Dan. 7: 7 and ך Dan. 7: 19; on the contrary, ך Deut. 21: 12. Jon. For ך stands ך Deut. 32: 27. Jon.

REM. 1. The possessive pronoun can be expressed also in Chaldee separately from its noun, namely by writing the suffixes of the verb with ך (derived from ך *relat.* and ך *dat.*) or (which is less common) ך (derived from ך and ך Gen.); e. g. ך ך rex, *qui tibi* i. e. *tuis*, כל ך Gen. 14: 23. Jon. *omne tuum*. In like manner, these forms are employed also substantively, e. g. 2 Kings 6: 11 ך our possessions, and even indeed as predicate of a sentence, Gen. 31: 43 כל דאָת הָנִי ךְּיִלִּי הוּא *all which thou seest, that is mine*.

REM. 2. The suffixes of plural nouns are connected also with such prepositions as are originally *nomina pluralia*; e. g. בְּחֵרִי, בְּחֵרִי, בְּחֵרִי, see § 38. 2. In like manner אִתְּ (Hebr. אִתְּ) and אִתְּ, receive the suffixes of plural nouns, e. g. אִתְּ, אִתְּ, אִתְּ, אִתְּ, and the suffix is here to be translated by the Nominative.

## § 9.

### Other Pronouns.

1. The Demonstrative Pronoun is as follows:

#### Singular.

- |    |                              |         |
|----|------------------------------|---------|
| m. | הַן, הַן (Jer. 26: 9).       | } that. |
|    | הַן (Job 9: 24).             |         |
| f. | הַן, הַן this, that.         | } this. |
| c. | הַן (Ps. 24: 6. 32: 8), הַן. |         |



## Plural.

c. אֵלֶּיךָ, אֵלֶּיהָ Jer. 10: 1), אֵלֶּיךָ (Dan. 3: 12) these, those.

The personal pronouns of the third Pers. and the demonstratives, united with the Heb. article, as הַזֶּה, הַזֶּה Exod. 20: 1) express our English *this very, precisely this*. So are to be explained אֵיךָ (אֵיךָ), אֵיךָ (Ruth 1:16. Lam.1: 4). That the demonstratives, moreover, can be employed in different cases by means of prepositions, will be understood without remark; e. g. 1 Sam. 25: 21 לְרִיךְ *to this* (masc.), Dan. 5: 6 לְרָא *to this* (fem.).

2. The *Relative Pronoun* is הִי (Hebr. הִי)<sup>1</sup> or as *prefix* הִי (which never occurs in biblical Chaldee), for both Genders and Numbers. In general usage, it denotes the Nominative (more rarely the Accusative); how the (other) oblique cases are expressed, is described in the Syntax § 41. 1.

3. The *Interrogative Pronoun* is represented, partly after the analogy of the Hebrew, by מִן *who?* (used of persons), and מָה, מָה (מָה 1 Sam. 14: 43) *what?* (used of things), partly by a combination of the interrogative particle מִן and the demonstrative Pronoun; e. g. מִן אֵיךָ *m. f. (הִיךָ, הִיךָ)*. Yet the latter is the more energetic expression, *who then?* The cases of both Interrogatives are formed in the usual manner: e. g. לְמִן *to whom?* לְמָה *for what?* לְמִיךָ *to whom then?* 1 Sam. 6: 20.

With מִן prefixed is found for the second Interrog. מִן-הִיךָ Esth. 7: 6, as well as מִן מִיךָ (עֲמָא) Jon. 1: 8, but with הִי prefixed, מִן מִיךָ.

The first Interrog. is sometimes united with the personal or demonstrative pronoun (*quis hic, quid hoc*), and is then contracted with this into one word; e. g. מִן הוּא (for מִן הוּא) Prov. 20: 6. 27: 4. מִיךָ Jer. 26: 9 (on the contrary, Gen. 26: 27. Jon. מִיךָ).

On the designation of the reflexive and reciprocal (*self*) pronouns, comp. the Syntax § 43, 1.

<sup>1</sup> Upon the Egyptian-Aramaean inscriptions this is written: זִי and זָא.

## CHAPTER III.

## The Verb.

## § 10.

*Derivation and Inflection of the Verb in general.*

1. The verbs are in their origin partly *primitive*, partly *derivative*. The former compose the great majority; the latter, which come from verbs (*verbalia*) or from nouns (*verba denominativa*), particularly the last, are few; and, as would naturally be supposed, present themselves commonly in the derived conjugations; e. g. שָׁרַשׁ *to outroot*, אָשְׁתָּרַשׁ *to take root*, from שָׁרַשׁ *root*, הָאָהָל *to pitch a tent*, from אָהָל *a tent*, וָיָרַד (אָזְרִיד *to furnish with provisions*, from וָיָרַד *viaticum*, אָשְׁתָּמוּדַע from מוּדַע *an acquaintance*.

Verbs admitted into Chaldee from the occidental languages, particularly Greek, are only few and such chiefly as denote technical manipulations; e. g. גָּלַף *γλύφειν*; from τὰξίς was formed טָקַס.

2. The stem-form of the verb consists usually of three consonants, which are pronounced in one syllable with the vowel *a* or *e* (less frequently *o*), under the second radical. Yet there are also some verbs with four letters (*quadrilittera*), which are accustomed to take the vowels *־*, *־*; e. g. סָכַבַל *to cover*; and two entire classes of verbs are in the stem-form biliteral, קָם, דָּק. The stem-form of the verb is at the same time the *tempus praeteritum*, and from it are derived, most directly, not only the other *tenses* and *modes*, but also a *Passive* with its corresponding *tenses* and *modes*.

3. But as in Hebrew, so here the ground-form of the verb lies at the basis of certain other forms which express the idea of their stem under some particular modification; and like that, may not only be inflected through all the usual *tenses* and *modes*, but are furnished also with *Passives* of their own, which undergo the same inflection. These forms are *two*: קָטַל and אָקַטַל. They are called (as well as the ground-form itself) *Conjugations*. There are,

therefore, in Chaldee *three* (ordinary) Conjugations. In regard to some others, less frequent, *Schaphel*, *Poel*, *Pilel*, see below § 14.

4. The *characteristics* and *signification* of the derived Conjugations are as follows: 1. The characteristic of the second Conj. or *Paël* is the doubling of the second stem-letter (corresponding to the Hebr. *Piël*). In *signification* it has generally an intensive meaning as compared with the verbal idea of the ground-form; e. g. *הִבֵּר* *frangere*, *הִכֵּר* *confringere*, *שִׁלַּח* to *send*, *שִׁלַּח* to *send away*. It is often causative, especially when *Peal* is intransitive; e. g. *הִכֵּם* to *be wise*, *הִכֵּם* *to make wise*; *הִחִיר* to *be white*, *הִחִיר* to *make white*, to *wash*; *הִכִּיחַ* to *be red*, *הִכִּיחַ* to *redden*, to *dye red*; *הִסִּיחַ* to *ascend*, *הִסִּיחַ* to *cause to ascend* (also to *take away*, to *remove*); sometimes merely with the application to *consider*, *declare*, *treat* a person or thing as that which the *Peal* expresses; e. g. *הִכָּזִיר* to *lie*, *הִכָּזִיר* to *declare one a liar*, to *convict one of falsehood*. So a denominative verb expresses in *Paël* the result of that which the *noun* denotes; e. g. *הִטִּיט* from *טִיט* to *spot*, *defile*, also *privation*; e. g. *הִרִישָׁן* to *take away ashes*, *הִסִּקֵּל* to *remove stones*, (comp. in English *head*, *behead*). 2. The third Conj. or *Aphel* is characterized by א (ה) prefixed to the stem-form and the vowel *e* or *i* in the last syllable. Its *signification* is usually causative of *Peal* (mostly in verbs, where *Paël* is not used, seldom if that Conj. exists at the same time; e. g. *הִכִּיחַ*, *הִכִּיחַ*); e. g. *הִקָּרַב* to *be near*, *הִקָּרַב* to *bring near* (to *present*), *הִלְבִּישׁ* to *put on*, *הִלְבִּישׁ* to *cause to put on*, to *clothe*, *הִקְבֵּל* to *be dark*, *obsure*, *הִקְבֵּל* to *obsure*, *הִחַטָּא* to *sin*, *הִחַטָּא* to *entice to sin*; or with the application to *declare*, etc. (like *Paël*); e. g. *הִאֲצִידֵק* to *declare just*, (judicially) to *acquit*. The causative is to be recognized also in cases, where in English an intransitive expression is employed: e. g. *הִאֲמִטֵּר* to *rain* (comp. *ὁ Ζεὺς ὕει*), *הִאֲשִׁיחֵהוּ*, *הִאֲצַמֵּחַ* etc.

The several conjugations are not used in all verbs; a great number of verbs occur merely in *Peal*, others merely in *Paël*. In respect to the latter limitation, comp. e. g. *זָמַר*, *הִזְמִיר*, *יָבַב*, *הִיבִיב*, *סָגַף*, *הִסְגִּיף*, *רָקַד*, *הִרְקִיד*; yet even then the intensive signification may be traced without difficulty in the *Paël*. If *Paël* and *Aphel* exist at the same time, they are generally different in their signification; e. g. *הִנְיָחָהּ* to *advise*, *הִנְיָחָהּ* to *ap-*



*point as king*, קָבַל *accepit (obedivit)*, אֶקְבַּל *obscuravit*. But sometimes both conjugations coincide in meaning; comp. סָמַק and אָסַמַק.

5. The Passives of all the conjugations are *characterized* by the prefixed syllable אָ (bibl. הָ), of which the following is to be remarked: a) When the verbal form begins with ה, ד, ט, the ה assimilates itself to the following letter and is denoted by *Dag. forte*; e. g. אָדָּבַר, אָטָּפַת, אָדָּבַר, from דָּבַר, טָפַת and תָּבַר (more rarely and only in the later Targums the same takes place before other consonants); e. g. אָבְהִיב Eccl. 12: 10, אָמְחִיל (for אֶמְחִיל) Ps. 49: 13, נָגָדְרוּ Ezek. 23: 48. Gen. 13: 7. 38: 9. Exod. 13: 10. 29: 43. Jon.); b) If the verbal form begins with a sibilant ש, צ, ס, ז, the ה is inserted after these letters; e. g. אָשְׁתָּבַק. In that case also, ה after צ passes into ט, after ז into ד; e. g. אָצַטְבַּע (for אֶצַּטְבַּע) אָדָּרְבַּן (for אֶדָּרְבַּן). To both these specifications, verbs עו constitute, for the most part, an exception, inasmuch as in these the ה of the prefix is doubled in *Hithpeal* and *Ittaphal*; as, יִהְיֶימִין, יִהְיֶדְנִין, Lam. 1: 1. Dan. 2: 5. Isa. 1: 12. The signification is not merely passive, but frequently also *reflexive*<sup>1</sup> or *reciprocal* (e. g. אָשְׁתַּוְּגַּח *to wash one's self*, אָתְקַרַּב *to nourish one's self*, אָתְחַלְּלָה *to take counsel, deliberate*, 1 Kings 12: 6). But the idea of reflexiveness is to be taken here in the wider sense, similar to that expressed by the *Middle voice* in Greek; e. g. אָסְתַּרְבַּן *to be useful to one's self, to derive advantage*. Even where *we* speak actively, the original reflexive application is still to be detected; e. g. אָתְיַהֲרַה or אָתְיַהֲרַה *to become a Jew* (to cause or suffer one's self to be made a Jew), אָתְעַרַּק *to flee* (to let one's self be put to flight). Accordingly, we might better perhaps term these forms with אָ Reflexives (as in fact the Hebr. *Hithpaël* together with *Niphal* was originally only *Reflexive*); but in the Aramaean where no other proper Passives exist, the *passive* signification has acquired in this conjugation the ascendancy, and they may hence also *a potiori* be denominated *Passives*.

Together with these Aramaean Passives, others (not merely in the

<sup>1</sup> We are not to consider this, but the passive signification as the original one; for the origination of a special form for the latter idea was a more urgent, nay, indispensable want of the language.

bibl. Chaldee) formed after the Hebrew (Pual and Hophal) sometimes present themselves; comp. § 12, 2. 4. 5. 6.

6. In regard to Tenses and Modes, the Chaldee has, in all the conjugations enumerated: a) a Praeter and Future; b) an Infinitive, Imperative (the latter in the Passives also), and a Participle (which in all the Actives is double). All these forms arise from the ground-form, directly or indirectly (as the *Fut.* immediately from the *Imp.*) by the addition of formative letters (ר, נ), by a varied pronunciation of the radical consonants, or in both ways. But the personal inflection in the Praeter and Imperative is effected, as in Hebrew, by sufformative syllables, in the Future by praeformative and sufformative syllables, at the same time. These syllables are fragmentary forms, derived from the personal Pronouns.

7. As in the formation of verbs, all the stem-letters remain unaltered, or one or two of them suffer a change by suppression or some mode of commutation, all verbs in Chaldee divide themselves into two principal classes. The former are called *regular* verbs, the latter *irregular*. This distinction we must here follow.

## § 11.

### *Inflection of the Regular Verb.*

1. With the *Praeter* connects itself most directly the *Imperative* in all the conjugations; from the Imperative proceeds the *Future*. The Imperative of *Peal* is characterized by the obtuse vowel ( ); the Imperatives of *Paël* and *Aphel*, as well as those of all the *Passives*, are identical in form with the Praeter.

2. The *Futures* arise from the Imperatives by prefixing ר, which in *Peal* is pronounced with פ, in *Paël* with פ, in *Aphel* (where the א is elided) with פ, but in all the *Passives* with פ (רפ).

3. The *Infinitives* are formed from the Praeters, in a two-fold way: a) in *Peal* by the prefixed syllable נ; b) in the other conjugations and all the *Passives*, by the annexation of נפ.

4. The *Participles* also arise most immediately from the form of the *Praet.*, and are formed: a) In Peal merely by a varied pronunciation of the stem-consonants (קָטַל, קָטִיל); b) In all the other conjugations and the Passives, by the prefixed מ, which in Paël is pronounced without a vowel, in Aphel with ׀, in the Passives with ׀ (מַר). Of the two Participles of the active conjugation the first, with ׀ in the last syllable, has always an *active* signification, the second, with ׀ in the last syllable, a *passive* signification.

5. The personal inflection is most simple in the *Praeters* and *Imperatives*, most complicated in the *Futures*. The formative letters and syllables are exhibited in the following table:

	Praeter.	Imperat.	Future.
3. Sing. m.	—		יִ—
f.	תִּ—		תִּ—
2. Sing. m.	תִּ— or תִּ—	—	תִּ—
f.	תִּ—	יִ—	תִּ— יִ
1. Sing. com.	תִּ—		אִ—
3. Plur. m.	יִ—		יִ— יִ
f.	אִ—		יִ— יִ
2. Plur. m.	תִּ— יִ	יִ—	תִּ— יִ
f.	תִּ— יִ	אִ— יִ	תִּ— יִ
1. Plur. com.	אִ— יִ		נִ—

6. When sufformatives are added, which take the tone: a) The vowels ׀, ׀, and ׀ (the latter only in the *Fut. Peal*) in the last syllable of the verb, are dropped, provided the sufformatives begin with a vowel; on the contrary, before the sufformative י and א of the third person *Praet.* and that of the second person of the *Imp.*, to which the tone is not transferred, these vowels are retained; b) In the third *fem.* and first *com.* of the *Praet.* sing. in Peal and Ithpeal, when in this way two vowelless consonants would come together, the helping-vowel ׀ is assumed.



The most essential deviation of the personal inflection of the Chaldee verb from the Hebrew consists in this, that the second Pers. sing. Praet. is the same in both genders; on the contrary, the third Pers. plur. Praet. along with the *Masc.* has also a *Fem.*; and that the third plur. *Fut. fem.* is formed by the praeform. ך (not ך), Moreover, the sufformatives of the *Fut.* (e. g. ךֿ) may here be more easily explained than in the Hebrew.

The Paradigm of all the conjugations of the regular verb is now as follows :

		Peal.	Ithpeal.	Paël.
<i>Praet.</i>	3. <i>m.</i>	קטל	אתקטל	קטל
	3. <i>f.</i>	קטלת	אתקטלת	קטלת
	2. <i>m.</i>	קטלת	אתקטלת	קטלתא, קטלת
	2. <i>f.</i>	קטלת	אתקטלת	קטלת
	1. <i>c.</i>	קטלת	אתקטלת	קטלת
<i>Plur.</i>	3. <i>m.</i>	קטלו	אתקטלו	קטלו
	3. <i>f.</i>	קטלא	אתקטלא	קטלא
	2. <i>m.</i>	קטלתון	אתקטלתון	קטלתון
	2. <i>f.</i>	קטלתון	אתקטלתון	קטלתון
	1. <i>c.</i>	קטלנא	אתקטלנא	קטלנא
<i>Infin.</i>		מקטל	אתקטלא	קטלא
<i>Imp.</i>	2. <i>m.</i>	קטל	אתקטל	קטל
	2. <i>f.</i>	קטלי	אתקטלי	קטלי
<i>Plur.</i>	2. <i>m.</i>	קטלו	אתקטלו	קטלו
	2. <i>f.</i>	קטלנא	אתקטלנא	קטלנא
<i>Fut.</i>	3. <i>m.</i>	יקטל	יתקטל	יקטל
	3. <i>f.</i>	תקטל	תתקטל	תקטל
	2. <i>m.</i>	תקטל	תתקטל	תקטל
	2. <i>f.</i>	תקטליון	תתקטליון	תקטליון
	1. <i>c.</i>	אקטל	אתקטל	אקטל
<i>Plur.</i>	3. <i>m.</i>	יקטלון	יתקטלון	יקטלון
	3. <i>f.</i>	יקטלן	יתקטלן	יקטלן
	2. <i>m.</i>	תקטלון	תתקטלון	תקטלון
	2. <i>f.</i>	תקטלון	תתקטלון	תקטלון
	1. <i>c.</i>	נקטל	נתקטל	נקטל
1. <i>Part.</i>	{ <i>m.</i> <i>f.</i>	קטל קטלא	מתקטל מתקטלא	מקטל מקטלא
2. <i>Part.</i>	{ <i>m.</i> <i>f.</i>	קטיל קטילא		מקטל מקטלא

[illegible]



## § 12.

*Remarks on the Paradigm of the Regular Verb.*

## 1. IN GENERAL.

1. The verbal forms with  $\text{--}$  are often written *plene*  $\text{--י}$  or with  $\text{--י}$ , namely: a) The ending of the first person *sing.*, as well as of the second *plur. fem.* of the Praeter, e. g.  $\text{שָׁמַעְתִּי}$  Gen. 3: 10,  $\text{נָשְׂרִיתִי}$  1 Sam. 25: 20,  $\text{עָבַרְתִּי}$  1 Kings 18: 13, 18,  $\text{הָלִיכִיתִי}$  Deut. 29: 5,  $\text{עָבַרְתִּיךְ}$  Exod. 1: 18. b) The *Paël* and *Aphel*, e. g.  $\text{אָתְּקִין}$  2 Kings 6: 23,  $\text{מָלִיכָה}$  Ps. 16: 2,  $\text{הָלִיכוּ}$  Josh. 18: 8,  $\text{הָלִיכִיתִי}$  Deut. 29: 5, Jon.,  $\text{קָבִילָה}$  Gen. 4: 11,  $\text{מָקַשְׁתִּי}$  Hos. 6: 3. c) The *Partic. act.* in *Peal*, e. g.  $\text{נָחָה}$  Dan. 4: 20,  $\text{נָכִיחַ}$  Gen. 3: 15,  $\text{פָּרִיק}$  Cant. 5: 8. On the other hand, the *Part. Peil* appears seldom as  $\text{תָּקַל}$  Dan. 5: 27, and in *Paël* and *Aphel*  $\text{--}$ , is sometimes shortened into  $\text{--}$  before suffixatives which begin with a consonant ( $\text{אֶעֱלֶהוֹן}$  Joel 3: 5,  $\text{שִׁירְבָתָהּ}$  2: 32. 3: 3; see below 2, 1).

2. *Praeter.* The second pers. *sing. masc.* assumes often the form  $\text{קָטַלְתָּ}$ ,  $\text{קָטַלְתָּ}$  Prov. 23: 8. 2 Sam. 14: 13,  $\text{אָתְּקַטַּלְתָּ}$  etc. Dan. 5: 22. 6: 13. Gen. 4: 10. 20: 9. 22: 16. 31: 26. Judg. 5: 11; and in the Praeter of *Paël* and *Aphel*, as well as in the Praeter *Peal* of such verbs as have their vowel in *e* or *o*, this form is the predominant one; comp. Dan. 2: 47  $\text{יִבְלַתָּ}$ , 5: 27  $\text{תִּקְלַתָּ}$ , Gen. 3: 17  $\text{קָבַלְתָּ}$ , 18: 5  $\text{מָלַכְתָּ}$ , 24: 14  $\text{זָמַנְתָּ}$ , 32: 28  $\text{אֶסְבְּלַתָּ}$  etc. To the third pers. *Plur. masc.*, in the later Targums, is sometimes attached the paragogic  $\text{ן}$ ; e. g.  $\text{עָבְדוּן}$  Gen. 3: 7,  $\text{שָׁבַחוּן}$  Ps. 148: 7. With a similar addition, occurs the third plur. fem.  $\text{אָתְּנִיחוּן}$  Gen. 3: 7. Jon.  $\text{אָמְרָאן}$  (אָמְרָאן) Exod. 4: 19 (T. H.), instead of  $\text{--}$ , both these forms have sometimes  $\text{--}$  under the second radical (especially in Ven.); e. g.  $\text{שָׁמַעוּ}$  Gen. 8: 3. Josh. 9: 1,  $\text{בָּלַעַ$  Gen. 41: 7.

3. *Future.* Instead of the formative  $\text{י}$ , we find also  $\text{נ}$  in the Targum of the *Proverbs*, in imitation of the Syriac; e. g.  $\text{נִדְּבִיל}$  Prov. 16: 10,  $\text{נִסְחִיוָהּ}$  10: 3,  $\text{נִנְטָר}$  2: 9,  $\text{נִתְפָּסַס}$  10: 31,  $\text{נִתְנַקֵּר}$  27: 18,  $\text{נִסְחָקְבַל}$  12: 27,  $\text{נִתְאַנָּה}$  29: 2; comp. Dathe *de ratione consensus vers. Chald. et Syr. Prov.* p. 16. Instead of  $\text{ן}$  the third pers. *Plur.* ends in  $\text{ו}$  Ezra 4: 12  $\text{רְחִישׁוּ}$ .

4. *Infinitive*. The ending of the Infinitive in *Ithpeal* and the following conjugations, becomes sometimes in bibl. Chaldee  $\text{ܐܝܬܦܥܠ}$ , instead of  $\text{ܐܝܬܦܥܠܐ}$ ; e. g. Dan. 2: 12, 14. Ezra 7: 14. Dan. 6: 4; but in the Targums  $\text{ܐܝܬܦܥܠܐ}$ ; e. g.  $\text{ܐܝܬܦܥܠܐ}$  Exod. 13: 21. Ezek. 13: 20,  $\text{ܐܝܬܦܥܠܐ}$  Ps. 102: 23. 119: 6. Num. 9: 17. 11: 17. Isa. 8: 12. Esth. 1: 5. 2: 8. In other instances the characteristic termination  $\text{ܐܝܬܦܥܠܐ}$  is wanting; e. g. 1 Sam. 26: 25. 30: 8. In *Paël* and *Aphel*, as well as in the Passives, the Infinitive has occasionally a prefixed  $\text{ܡܝ}$ ; e. g.  $\text{ܡܝܬܦܥܠܐ}$  Cant. 1: 7,  $\text{ܡܝܬܦܥܠܐ}$  Deut. 32: 23 (T. H.),  $\text{ܡܝܬܦܥܠܐ}$  Ps. 118: 9,  $\text{ܡܝܬܦܥܠܐ}$  Exod. 21: 20. Lev. 5: 21 (T. H.). Lev. 26: 15. Jon. Exod. 7: 3. Jon. Infrequent are forms of the Infinitive like  $\text{ܩܬܘܠܝ}$  Lev. 13: 7. Jon.  $\text{ܩܬܘܠܝ}$  Gen. 22: 5. Jon.  $\text{ܩܬܘܠܝ}$  Gen. 2: 9. Jon.),  $\text{ܩܬܘܠܝ}$  Esth. 2: 3,  $\text{ܩܬܘܠܝ}$  Ps. 92: 3,  $\text{ܩܬܘܠܝ}$  Job 1: 13,  $\text{ܩܬܘܠܝ}$  Deut. 18: 10 (T. H.), with  $\text{ܩܬܘܠܝ}$  *parag*.

5. *Passive*. The prefix  $\text{ܐܝܬ}$ , for which in bibl. Chaldee and often elsewhere  $\text{ܐܝܬ}$  is employed (Ezra 6: 2. 7: 15. Dan. 3: 27, 28. 6: 22. 5: 27, etc.), only a few times  $\text{ܐܝܬ}$ , comp. § 25. 2, is sometimes exchanged for  $\text{ܐܝܬ}$  in the *Praet.* and *Inf.* in the later Chaldee; e. g.  $\text{ܐܝܬܦܥܠܐ}$  1 Sam. 23: 7 (which is closely related to the *Rabb.* conjugation *Nithpaël*). In the Participles, the  $\text{ܡܝ}$  is but seldom omitted; e. g.  $\text{ܡܝܬܦܥܠܐ}$  Job 28: 21,  $\text{ܡܝܬܦܥܠܐ}$  Gen. 31: 15, T. H.; on the contrary, the Infinitives sometimes assume it: see No. 4.

## 2. REMARKS ON THE CONJUGATIONS SEVERALLY.

1. *Peal*. The distinguishing vowel of the ground-form (*Praet.*) in a considerable number of verbs, particularly such as have an intransitive signification, is  $\text{ܐܝܬ}$  ( $\text{ܐܝܬ}$ ) or  $\text{ܐܝܬ}$  ( $\text{ܐܝܬ}$ ), less frequently  $\text{ܐܝܬ}$ ; e. g. a)  $\text{ܐܝܬܐܠܐ}$  to be sad,  $\text{ܐܝܬܐܠܐ}$  to be bad,  $\text{ܐܝܬܐܠܐ}$  to be good,  $\text{ܐܝܬܐܠܐ}$  to sit,  $\text{ܐܝܬܐܠܐ}$  to lie,  $\text{ܐܝܬܐܠܐ}$  to be strong. b)  $\text{ܐܝܬܐܠܐ}$  to sleep, Gen. 2: 21,  $\text{ܐܝܬܐܠܐ}$  to be dry,  $\text{ܐܝܬܐܠܐ}$  to be bereaved, to be an orphan. In most of these verbs, the Syriac and Arabic agree in this punctuation; comp.  $\text{ܐܝܬܐܠܐ}$ ,  $\text{ܐܝܬܐܠܐ}$ ,  $\text{ܐܝܬܐܠܐ}$  ( $\text{ܐܝܬܐܠܐ}$ ), and the distinction of verbs in *a* and *e* is in general more strongly marked in the Aramaean than in Hebrew. Occasionally both forms are in use at the same time; as,  $\text{ܐܝܬܐܠܐ}$ ,  $\text{ܐܝܬܐܠܐ}$ ;  $\text{ܐܝܬܐܠܐ}$ ,  $\text{ܐܝܬܐܠܐ}$ ;  $\text{ܐܝܬܐܠܐ}$  and  $\text{ܐܝܬܐܠܐ}$ .

The vowels *e* (*i*), *o* remain; a) In the other persons of the *Praet.* as inflected, where in other verbs  $\text{--}$  is pronounced ( $\text{שָׁאַלְנָא}$  Ezra 5: 9,  $\text{נִצְבְּחוּן}$  Josh. 24: 13,  $\text{סָלִיקְנָא}$  Judg. 15: 10,  $\text{סָלְקוּ}$  Ezra 4: 12,  $\text{תְּרֹבּוּ}$  Jer. 49: 4; also the third *fem.* and first *com.* retain regularly the vowel under the second radical; as,  $\text{בָּטְלָה}$  Ezra 4: 24,  $\text{תְּרֹבַת}$  Ezek. 26: 2,  $\text{שָׁאַלָה}$  Prov. 10: 7,  $\text{טַעַמִּית}$  1 Sam. 14: 43,  $\text{קָטְלִית}$  2 Chron. 25: 19,  $\text{תְּלִימִית}$  Gen. 37: 6, Ven. Sometimes, however, a shortening of the  $\text{--}$  into  $\text{--}$  takes place in closed syllables; e. g.  $\text{שָׁאַלְנָא}$ ,  $\text{שָׁאַלְחוּן}$  1 Sam. 1: 21. 12: 13. Judg. 13: 6. Ezra 5: 91. 2 Chron. 25: 16. b) In the *Imper.*, verbs in *e* have commonly  $\text{--}$  or  $\text{--}$  ( $\text{--}$ ); e. g.  $\text{לָבַשׁ}$  1 Kings 22: 30,  $\text{קָרַב}$  Job 2: 5. Ruth 2: 14. Josh. 24: 14,  $\text{אָוֵל}$  or  $\text{אָוִיל}$  Gen. 22: 2. 1 Sam. 3: 9. Ps. 34: 12. Joel 1: 12, 13; but in the *Fut.* ( $\text{--}$ ); e. g.  $\text{הִלָּכַשׁ}$  Dan. 5: 16,  $\text{יִשְׁפַח}$  Dan. 4: 24; or ( $\text{--}$ ), e. g.  $\text{הִתְרַיַב}$  Deut. 28: 30; or  $\text{י}$ , e. g.  $\text{יִתְקַוֶּה}$  Gen. 31: 35,  $\text{תִּסְגֹּדוּ}$  Exod. 20: 5. When in *one verb* two forms of the *Fut.*, in  $\text{--}$  and  $\text{--}$ , or in  $\text{--}$  and  $\text{י}$ , exist together, each has uniformly a peculiar signification; e. g.  $\text{יִקְרַב}$  Num. 1: 51 *he will approach* (*Futurum*),  $\text{יִקְרַב}$  Isa. 5: 19 *may he approach* (*Optative*) Exod. 3: 5;  $\text{יִתְקַוֶּה}$  Gen. 25: 23 *he will overpower*,  $\text{יִתְקַוֶּה}$  Gen. 31: 35 *he will be mighty* (*valebit*);  $\text{יִשְׁלֹט}$  Dan. 5: 7 *he shall rule*,  $\text{יִשְׁלֹט}$  Eccl. 8: 9 *he is accustomed to rule*. Verbs with  $\text{י}$ , on the contrary, form the *Fut.* in  $\text{י}$ ; e. g.  $\text{יִרְמֹדֶה}$  Ps. 121: 4.

In the *Praeter* of verbs in *a*, such forms as  $\text{קָטְלִית}$  and  $\text{קָטְלָה}$  occur in the Ven. text along with  $\text{קָטְלָה}$ ,  $\text{קָטְלָה}$ , for which the London edition has  $\text{קָטְלָה}$  (§ 15. Rem. 3) and  $\text{קָטְלָה}$  (Gen. 30: 16. 1 Kings 18: 13. Ruth 2: 14. Josh. 24: 11. Jer. 36: 31). The third plural also is written  $\text{קָטְלוּ}$  in the Ven.; see above 1. 2.

The *Infinitive* has sometimes, in the later Targums, the termination (of the *Stat. emphat.*  $\text{א--}$ ; e. g.  $\text{מִסְפָּדָא}$  Ps. 118: 7. Lev. 27: 10 (T. H.), still more frequently  $\text{מִקְטָל}$  Job 29: 6. Ruth 4: 6. Gen. 16: 5. Jon. or  $\text{מִקְטִיל}$  Esth. 9: 1. Gen. 15: 12. Jon. Ruth 3: 4. Isa. 20: 6. (the latter together with the forms in  $\text{--}$ ); uncommon are the Hebraizing forms  $\text{קָטֹל}$  or  $\text{קָטֹל}$ ; e. g. Gen. 49: 6. Ruth 2: 1. Judg. 9: 54. Ps. 105: 14 (even with *Suffix.*).

*Imperative.* The *scriptura plena* of this form  $\text{קָטֹל}$  occurs only sometimes; e. g.  $\text{שְׁתוּקִי}$  2 Sam. 13: 20,  $\text{רְחוּמוֹ}$  Ps. 31: 24. There



is found also, after the Hebrew analogy כָּחוֹן Ps. 26: 2, כָּחוֹב Jer. 36: 28, כָּרוֹד Gen. 21: 10. Jon. It is but very seldom that the vowel stands under the first radical in the second *fem. sing. plur.*, as שָׁלַחוּ Isa. 32: 1.

2. *Ithpeal*. Two forms prevail here אֶתְקַטֵּל (especially in verbs 3. and 2. Gutt., but also elsewhere Job 30: 18. Jer. 13: 11. Gen. 14: 15. Judg. 12: 1. Obad. 6.) and אֶתְקַטֵּל or (still more frequently אֶתְקַטֵּל, אֶתְקַטֵּל; e. g. אֶתְקַטֵּל Jer. 50: 23, אֶתְקַטֵּל Job 33: 25, אֶתְקַטֵּל Amos 9: 1, אֶתְקַטֵּל 1 Sam. 14: 39, אֶתְקַטֵּל Eccl. 12: 11, אֶתְקַטֵּל Dan. 45: 3, אֶתְקַטֵּל Dan. 3: 28, אֶתְקַטֵּל Jer. 49: 25, אֶתְקַטֵּל Isa. 1: 2, *Fut.* אֶתְקַטֵּל Amos 7: 17, אֶתְקַטֵּל Dan. 2: 24, אֶתְקַטֵּל Gen. 4: 13. Lev. 4: 20, אֶתְקַטֵּל Isa. 23: 18, אֶתְקַטֵּל Lev. 27: 20, אֶתְקַטֵּל 2 Kings 7: 4. Gen. 24: 11, participles מֶתְקַטֵּל Ps. 84: 13, מֶתְקַטֵּל Esth. 8: 8, מֶתְקַטֵּל Exod. 3: 2. Of the form in *a*, the third *fem. sing. Praet.*, even in verbs not Gutt., sometimes makes אֶתְקַטֵּל (see above); e. g. Isa. 50: 2, and of the verbs in *e*, the first pers. sing. may occur with three syllables; as, אֶתְקַטֵּל Ps. 119: 31.

3. *Paël*. The first pers. *Fut.* has sometimes ׀ under the preformative; e. g. אֶתְקַטֵּר Isa. 42: 9, אֶתְקַטֵּר Isa. 63: 3, also the full vowel יֵי; e. g. אֶתְקַטֵּר Deut. 32: 1. Jon.

4. *Ithpaal*. The vowel of the last syllable is in the *Praeter* sometimes ׀ or ׀; e. g. אֶתְקַטֵּר Hos. 4: 16, אֶתְקַטֵּר Ps. 105: 25, אֶתְקַטֵּר Judg. 15: 9. The third *fem.* and first *com. sing.* is found often, especially in the Venet. text, with four syllables; as, אֶתְקַטֵּר or אֶתְקַטֵּר (Gen. 21: 2. Jon. Ruth 2: 19. Isa. 1: 7); on the contrary, the third persons *plur.* are reduced to three syllables; as, אֶתְקַטֵּר Hos. 4: 6, 17. Isa. 60: 8. A Hebraistic *Pual* form occurs מְקַטֵּר Isa. 53: 5, מְקַטֵּר Gen. 28: 17. Jon., מְקַטֵּר Gen. 37: 3. T. H.

5. *Aphel*. In the bibl. Chaldee, ה appears commonly as the preformative of this conjugation, and this has been retained even in the *Fut.* and *Part.* between the preformative and the verb (after the manner of הִקְטֵל); e. g. הִקְטֵר Ezra 5: 12, הִקְטֵר Dan. 5: 29, הִקְטֵר Ezra 4: 19, הִקְטֵר Ruth 1: 21, הִקְטֵר Dan. 7: 24, הִקְטֵר Ezra 4: 13, הִקְטֵר Ezra 6: 10, הִקְטֵר Ezra 6: 11. The same occurs in verbs פִּי and פִּן also in the Targums; e. g.

הורֶעֶת Ps. 77: 15, הורֶעֶת Ezek. 20: 11, הֶהוּרַע Ps. 16: 11, הֶהוּרַע Job 15: 13 comp. further Gen. 1: 24. 38: 24. Exod. 29: 46. Deut. 7: 21. Jon. In the Praeter, the forms which according to the Paradigm reject the characteristic vowel of the final syllable (especially in Ven.), retain the same; e. g. Num. 8: 17 אֶקְרַשִׁית, Jer. 50: 13 אֶרְגִּינָה. Instead of the *Aphel*, the exact punctuation of the *Hiphil* is several times found in the bibl. Chaldee; e. g. דָּאֶהֱוִיל Dan. 7: 22. 5: 20.

6. *Ittaphal*. The place of this conjugation, which occurs very seldom anywhere, is always supplied in the bibl. Chaldee by *Hophal*; e. g. Ezra 4: 15. Dan. 4: 33. 7: 11 (with  $\text{—}$  or  $\text{ו}$ ), from the Targums, comp. Jon. מוֹיָמָן Exod. 15: 17, מוֹפְסֵל Num. 8: 24.

## § 13.

*Personal Inflection of the Participles.*

1. The *Participles* of all the conjugations, in order to express the *finite verb*, are united, as in the Hebrew, with the separable pronouns (of the first and second pers.); e. g. קָטַל אֲנִי *I kill*, § 47. 1. But it is peculiar to the Aramaean, that here the *Participles* (in the *sing.* as well as *plur.*) flow together with these pronouns into one word, whereby a sort of new *tense* arises; e. g. קָטַלְתָּ, מְקַטְלְתָּ (1 Kings 18: 15). We give here the inflection of both participles in Peal, in full:

		Sing.		Plur.
<i>Active.</i>	1. m.	קָטַלְתָּ	1. m.	קָטַלְתֶּם
	f.	קָטַלְתְּ	f.	קָטַלְתֶּן
	2. m.	קָטַלְתָּ	2. m.	קָטַלְתֶּם
	f.	קָטַלְתְּ	f.	קָטַלְתֶּן
<i>Passive.</i>	1. m.	קָטִילְתָּ	1. m.	קָטִילְתֶּם
	f.	קָטִילְתְּ	f.	קָטִילְתֶּן
	2. m.	קָטִילְתָּ	2. m.	קָטִילְתֶּם
	f.	קָטִילְתְּ	f.	קָטִילְתֶּן

2. But the power of the language for such combinations extends still further. In the biblical Chaldee, a passive *Praeter* is formed by uniting the *Part. Peil* with the sufformatives of the *Praeter*. The compound, thus obtained, supplies the place of the *Ithpeal*. It is inflected thus :

		Sing.		Plur.
3.	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} m. \\ f. \end{array} \right.$	קָטִיל	$m.$	קָטִילוּ
		קָטִילָה	$f.$	קָטִילוּן
2.	$c.$	קָטִילָהּ	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} m. \\ f. \end{array} \right.$	קָטִילוּן
				קָטִילוּן
1.	$c.$	קָטִילָהּ	$c.$	קָטִילוּן

Comp. Dan. 5: 27, 28, 30. 6: 4. 7: 4, 6, 11. Ezra 5: 14. That we are not to consider these forms as *Praet. Peal* with  $\text{—}$ , is shown partly by the passive signification which they have in these passages, partly by the circumstance that other forms of these verbs are used in the *Praet.* in an active sense.

According to the Ven. ed., similar formations from the active participles also are found in the Chaldee of the Targums; e. g. אָמְרוּ Cant. 1: 1, פָּהֲחָה Gen. 4: 11, and with  $i$  in the second syllable צָבִירָה Ruth 2: 17, from אָמַר, פָּחַח, צָבִיר, etc.

## § 14.

### *Unusual Conjugations and Quadriliteral Verbs.*

1. As in Hebrew, so here there are certain less frequent conjugations in addition to those in ordinary use, and which are produced sometimes by the insertion of a quiescent, sometimes by the reduplication of a stem-consonant. Some of these are found uniformly in certain classes of the irregular verb, namely: 1) *Po-ël* and *Ithpoal*, with the same characteristics which it has in Hebrew; e. g. סוּפֵק Hos. 13: 5, סוּפֵק Deut. 2: 7. Jon., סוּבֵר Num. 11: 12, מְסוּבָּרָא Gen. 45: 1, מְסוּבָּלִין Ezra 6: 3, from עָבַד, שׁוּבָם, אֲשֶׁתְּחַוֶּם; 2) *Palel* with *Ithpalel* אֲשֶׁתְּחַוֶּם, טַעֲמָם Ps. 143: 4. So likewise *Polel* with *Ithpolal* (in *Verbs* עָבַד); e. g. רוּחַ Ps. 75: 8. Dan. 4: 34, רוּחַ Jer. 12: 19, אֲחֵרוּם Dan. 5: 23. Ps. 107: 25. 3) *Palpel* (with



a repetition of the first and second stem-consonant) and *Ithpalpal*; e. g. בָּלָלָל Gen. 11: 9, טָמְטָטָט (from טָמָה) Judg. 3: 22, גָּלָלָל (from גָּלָל) Lam. 3: 3, רָכַרַךְ (from רָכָה) Ps. 143: 3 (see the verbs טָמָה and רָכָה). Infrequent are, 4) *Schaphel* and *Ischthaphal*; e. g. טָכַלָל Ezra 4: 12. Gen. 49: 10, אָשְׁתַּעֲבַד Gen. 49: 10, יִשְׁתַּכַּלָל Ezra 4: 13, or *Taphel*; e. g. תָּרַגַּם to interpret.

Under No. 1. can be embraced also forms like שִׁיזְבָּחָא Exod. 5: 23), שִׁיזְבָּחָא 1 Sam. 30: 22, שִׁיזְבָּחוֹן Josh. 22: 31, אָשְׁתִּיזָב 1 Sam. 22: 1. Fut. שִׁיזְבַּח Dan. 3: 17. etc. But they approach much nearer to *Paël*, inasmuch as the reduplication is compensated by a long vowel; comp. § 7. a. (שִׁיזְבַּח for שִׁיזְבָּח); also שִׁיזָּא Ezra 6: 15 (שִׁיזָּא Gen. 2: 2), *Pass.* אָשְׁתִּיזָּא Ps. 23: 26 to complete (which others consider as *Schaphel* from יִצָּא), appears to belong here.

2. The *quadriliteral verbs* have commonly the form of *Paël*; e. g. קָטַרַג Syr. ܩܬܪܓ (κατηγορεῖν) Job 37: 20, סָרַבָּל Job 20: 15, סָרַהַב and אָסְתַּרַהַב Ps. 106: 13. Prov. 12: 19, סָקַבָּל Prov. 12: 27, פָּרַכַּס Gen. 22: 10 T. H., סָנִיַר Num. 16: 14. Jon., אָסְתַּלָּעַס and סָלָעַס, אָתַּגְרָדַס and גָּרַדַס, אָתַּפְרָנַס and פָּרַנַס Ps. 39: 11. Their origin must be explained essentially in the same manner as in the Hebrew language. See Gesenius, Lehrgebäude, p. 861 sq.

The forms סָרַהַב, סָקַבָּל and סָנִיַר can also be regarded as a conjugation *Saphel* (softened from *Schaphel*) from סָרַהַב, קָבַל, נוֹר. Indeed, the quadriliteral verbs generally and these more infrequent conjugations are closely related and flow easily into each other.

## § 15.

### *Guttural Verbs.*

As the Gutturals (ע, ח, ה, א, and in part ר) have the same properties in Chaldee as in Hebrew, it follows that the same rules for substance apply to the inflection of the guttural verbs here, which apply to them there. Presupposing, therefore, an acquaintance with these rules, we subjoin at once a summary of the inflection of such verbs (with the necessary references), followed by some more particular explanations in regard to details.

VERBS 1. GUTTURAL.

*Peal Praet.* עָבַד 3. *f.* עָבַדְתָּ 2. *m.* אָזַלְתָּ 1. *Sing.* אָמְרָה, עָבַדְתָּ, *Imp.* אָמְרִי, עָבְדִי (עָבִיד Gen. 6: 14. Ps. 34: 5), אָזַל (אָזִיל) Exod. 3: 4, plur. אָבִידוּ Gen. 34: 10. Judg. 9: 49, אָמְרוּ (אָמְרוּ Dan. 2: 9. Gen. 12: 13), *Infin.* מַעֲבִיד, מַחֲזִיר, *Fut.* יַחֲזֹר, יַעֲרֹק, יַעֲבִיד, יַעֲבִיר (יַעֲבִידוּן, *Ezra* 7: 18. see § 7. d.), *Part.* עָבִיד, עָבִיר. — *Ithpeal.* אֶתְעַבֵּד, אֶתְעַבֵּר. — *Paël Praet.* עָבַד, *Fut.* יַעֲבִיר. — *Ithpaal.* אֶתְעַבֵּר. — *Aphel Praet.* אֶעֱבִד, אֶחַסֵּן, אֶחַרִּיב, *Fut.* יַחֲלִיף, יַחַסֵּס, *Part.* מַחֲלֵף.

VERBS 2. GUTTURAL.

*Peal Praet.* בָּחַן 3. *fem.* יִחַבֵּחַ, 1. *sing.* יִחַבִּיחַ, *Imp.* בָּחֵן (בָּחוֹן), בָּחֵנוּ (Josh. 24: 14 sq.), *Infin.* מִבְּחֵן (מִיֵּחַח Ps. 19: 8), *Fut.* יִבְחֵן, *Part.* בָּחִין, בָּחִין. — *Ithpeal.* אֶתְבַּחֵן, אֶתְחַבֵּחַ. — *Paël Praet.* חָרַשׁ, אָחַד, בָּרָה, בָּרָה, *Fut.* יִקְרַב (יִקְרְבוּן Gen. 3: 3), *Infin.* קָרְבָּא. — *Aphel Praet.* אֶבְחֵן etc.

VERBS 3. GUTTURAL.

*Peal Praet.* שָׁבַח 3. *f.* שָׁבַחְתָּ, *Imp.* שָׁבְחִי, שָׁבְחִי (Joel 1: 14. Exod. 5: 18), שָׁבְחֵנוּ Joel 2: 15, *Fut.* יִשְׁבַּח, יִשְׁלַח (יִשְׁמוֹעַ), *Part.* שָׁבַח, שָׁבַח, שָׁמַע, שָׁמַח. — *Ithpeal.* אֶשְׁבַּחְתָּ 3. *f.* אֶשְׁבַּחְתָּ. — *Paël Praet.* and *Imp.* שָׁבַח, רָבַר, בָּסַר (Ps. 22: 25), *Fut.* יִשְׁבַּח, *Part. act.* מְשַׁבַּח Dan. 4: 34. — *Ithpaal.* אֶשְׁבַּח, אֶתְנַבֵּר. — *Aphel Praet.* אֶשְׁבַּח, אֶשְׁבִּיחַ.

1. The vowelless א of verbs 1. guttural often falls away in *Ithpeal*, and the ה of the prefix then receives *Dag. forte*; e. g. אֶתְחַדֵּר for אֶתְחַדֵּר, אֶתְנַבֵּר for אֶתְנַבֵּר, אֶתְנַבֵּר for אֶתְנַבֵּר Job 34: 31. Num. 15: 13. 35: 33. Hag. 1: 6. Job 34: 31. 1 Sam. 26: 20. On contracted forms of *Ithpaal*, like אֶתְנַבֵּר, see § 21.

2. Some verbs 2. א take י in the second conjugation; e. g. שָׁיַר Exod. 10: 12. Jon., from שָׁיַר, שָׁיַל Ps. 106: 14. 137: 3.

3. In verbs 3. gutt., the third Pers. *sing. fem.* of the Praeter ends sometimes in  $\text{—}$  or  $\text{—}$  (the latter especially on the occurrence of a ר); e. g. שָׁבַחְתָּ Ruth 2: 14, שָׁלַחְתָּ 1 Kings 21: 11, פָּתַחְתָּ Deut. 11: 6, חָבַרְתָּ Exod. 5: 6, רָחַחְתָּ Esth. 1: 12, אָמַרְתָּ Gen. 30: 16, אָמַרְתָּ Dan. 5:

10, דָּבַרְתָּ Gen. 16: 3, אָתְּקַבַּרְתָּ Gen. 35: 19, אֶהְבֶּרְתָּ Job 6: 13, הִחַנְנִיתָ Dan. 3: 34. This formation is less frequent in the first sing.; e. g. Dan. 2: 25 הִשְׁכַּחְתָּ for אֲשַׁכַּחְתָּ. In verbs 2. *gutt.*, the third *sing.* is sometimes inflected in the above manner; e. g. רָהַטָּה Judg. 13: 10.

4. The composite Sheva, which appears in these verbs instead of Sheva simple, is uniformly ׀; verbs פִּא only have in the *Imper. Peal* usually ׀, e. g. אָמַר Dan. 2: 4, 9, אָזַל Gen. 22: 2; in like manner, verbs פִּה in *Infin. Peal*, e. g. מָהָרַר Cant. 5: 3. — On those verbs פִּא which are treated as verbs quiesc. 1. rad., see § 21.

5. Forms like הִחַסִּינָה Dan. 7: 22, הִאָּהֲרִיל are to be considered as *Hiph.*, not as *Aphel*.

## § 16.

### *Regular Verbs with Suffixes.*

Of the suffixes enumerated above in § 8. 2, those which begin with a vowel are, as a general usage, naturally connected with verbal forms which end with a consonant; and, *vice versa*, those beginning with a consonant are connected with verbal forms which end with a vowel. The Imperatives and Participles only form here an almost uniform exception; since they receive suffixes (of the first pers. *sing.* and *plur.*) which are commonly destitute of a connective vowel; e. g. קָטַלְתִּי (קָטַלְתִּי 1 Sam. 20: 8), קָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְתִּי, comp. Num. 11: 12, 15. Judg. 9: 54. 1 Sam. 20: 8. Hos. 8: 2. Gen. 27: 34, 38. Ps. 25: 2. 41: 11. Besides, the suffix third pl. is usually appended to the third *fem. sing.* of the Praeter in the form נָתַן and נָתַן; see 2. a. [In general, the accession of the personal Pronoun to the verbal form itself is far more common than its connection with the sign of the accusative ׀].

2. The changes which the verbal forms undergo in consequence of the addition of the *suffixes*, affect almost exclusively the vowels; these are sometimes rejected, sometimes transposed. The following particulars may be specified:

a) Before suffixes which have a connective vowel, the third Pers. sing. in the *Praet. Peal* assumes the form קָטַל, and the *fem.* that of קָטַלְתָּ (קָטַלְתָּ); e. g. קָטַלְתָּ *he has killed thee*, קָטַלְתָּ *he has killed us*, קָטַלְתֶּם *he has killed them* (eos), קָטַלְתִּי *she has killed me*, נִסְבַּחְתָּ Exod. 2: 5, קָטַלְתָּה Judg. 9: 54. 14: 17 (with *gutt.* רָהַבְתָּ Judg.



15: 6, בִּלְעָהוּ Deut. 11: 6. Exod. 15: 12). Before בּוֹן and בֵּן, the original form remains; on the contrary, before נוֹן and נִין, the third fem. becomes קָטַלָה (Gen. 31: 32. Jon., גָּבַהֲנוּן), in *gutt.* verbs שָׁלַחַה (Exod. 15: 2 בִּלְעָהוּן, see above). — The third *plur. masc.* is pronounced קָטַלוּ, but before בּוֹן and בֵּן, becomes קָטַלוּן (comp. § 12. 1, 2); the second *plur. masc.* remains unchanged before suffixes beginning with a vowel קָטַלְתֶּינָה, קָטַלְתֶּינוּן; those which begin with נ are attached to the form קָטַלְתֶּינָה; e. g. קָטַלְתֶּינָה, קָטַלְתֶּינָה. The third *plur. fem.* makes קָטַלְתֶּינָה; (e. g. קָטַלְתֶּינָה). The second *sing.* undergoes no change; e. g. קָטַלְתֶּינָה, קָטַלְתֶּינָה; but for the fem. sometimes occurs קָטַלְתֶּינָה Jer. 15: 10. Judg. 11: 35. The first *sing.* makes קָטַלְתֶּינָה, seldom קָטַלְתֶּינָה Num. 23: 11. Jer. 30: 14, the first *plur.* קָטַלְתֶּינָה; e. g. קָטַלְתֶּינָה, קָטַלְתֶּינָה, only the *fem.* קָטַלְתֶּינָה connects itself with קָטַלְתֶּינָה.

In ed. Ven. the ground-form retains the vowel under the second radical before suffixes; e. g. שָׁלַחַה, שָׁלַחַה Jer. 28: 15. Exod. 4: 28. In other copies also this occurs; e. g. Josh. 24: 17. Lond. נִשְׁרָפָה.

b) The persons of the *Imper. Peal* suffer so much the less change, since the regular suffixes assumed here are without the tone, as קָטַלְתֶּינָה (קָטַלְתֶּינָה Judg. 9: 54), קָטַלְתֶּינָה; the second *plur. fem.* only is shortened into קָטַלְתֶּינָה. But in the *Fut.*, when the verbal form ends with a stem-consonant, the ו of the last syllable falls away before suffixes which begin with a vowel; e. g. קָטַלְתֶּינָה, קָטַלְתֶּינָה Gen. 4: 14. Esth. 5: 14 etc.

c) The *Infin.* and the *Participles Peal* are treated in conformity with their character as nouns; but according to the light in which they are viewed, either as parts of the verb or as substantives, they may take the suffixes of the verb or noun; e. g. קָטַלְתֶּינָה (Dan. 6: 21. Exod. 2: 14. 21: 34. Num. 18: 23 etc. and קָטַלְתֶּינָה.

d) In all the persons of *Paël* and *Aphel*, which terminate in the third radical, the vowel ו is rejected on the accession of a suffix which has a connective vowel; e. g. קָטַלְתֶּינָה, קָטַלְתֶּינָה, קָטַלְתֶּינָה. The same takes place (on account of the tone being thrown forward) in the forms קָטַלְתֶּינָה, קָטַלְתֶּינָה. Further, the terminations of the second Pers. *sing. fem.*, of the second Pers. *plur. masc.* and the

first Pers. *plur.* in the Praeter are the same that were mentioned above in the Peal; and the first *sing. Praet.* is formed like קָטַלְתָּ; e. g. Judges 13: 14 פָּקַדְתָּהּ *I have directed her.*

e) The Infinitives of *all* the conjugations except Peal usually take before suffixes the ending וּח; e. g. קָטְלוּתִיהָ (Exod. 20: 8), אֶחְקְטְלוּתֶיךָ (Dan. 3: 16. Exod. 2: 3), Ezek. 6: 8. Num. 16: 9. 20: 12. § 12. 1, 4; sometimes, especially before the suffix third *plur.*, the Infinitives of every termination appear without this connective syllable; e. g. אוֹבְדֵיהוֹן Deut 7: 10, אֶחְאָבְבִיהוֹן Judg. 3: 26.

PARADIGM

OF THE REGULAR VERB WITH SUFFIXES IN PEAL.

*Praeterite.*

*Future.*

	Sing.	Plur.		Sing.	Plur.
3. <i>m.</i>	קָטַלְנִי	קָטַלּוּנִי		יִקְטַלֵּנִי	יִקְטַלּוּנִי
	קָטַלְךָ	קָטַלּוּכָא		יִקְטַלֶּנְךָ	יִקְטַלּוּנְךָ
	קָטַלְכוֹן	קָטַלּוּךְ		יִקְטַלֵּנְכוֹן	יִקְטַלּוּנְכוֹן
	קָטַלְהָ	קָטַלּוּנָהּ		יִקְטַלֶּנָּה	יִקְטַלּוּנָהּ
	קָטַלְנוֹן	קָטַלּוּהִי		יִקְטַלֵּנוֹן	יִקְטַלּוּנוֹן
	(קָטַלְנוֹן)	קָטַלּוּנוֹן			
3. <i>f.</i>	קָטַלְתִּנִּי	קָטַלְנִי	<i>Imperative.</i>		
	קָטַלְתְּךָ	קָטַלְךָ	<i>m.</i>	קָטַלְנִי	קָטַלּוּנִי
	קָטַלְתְּכוֹן	קָטַלְכוֹן		קָטַלְהָ	קָטַלּוּהִי
	קָטַלְתִּיהָ	קָטַלְהִי		קָטַלְנָא	קָטַלּוּנוֹן
	קָטַלְתְּנוֹן	קָטַלְנוֹן		קָטַלְנוֹן	
2. <i>m.</i>	קָטַלְתִּנִּי	קָטַלְתּוּנִי	<i>f.</i>	קָטַלְיִנִּי	
	קָטַלְתִּיהָ	קָטַלְתּוּנָהּ		קָטַלְיִהִי	
	קָטַלְתְּנוֹן	קָטַלְתּוּנוֹן		קָטַלְיִנוֹן	
2. <i>f.</i>	קָטַלְתִּינִי		<i>Infinitive.</i>		
	קָטַלְתִּיהִי			מִקְטַלִּי	
	קָטַלְתִּינוֹן			מִקְטַלְךָ	
1. <i>c.</i>	קָטַלְתְּךָ	קָטַלְנְךָ		מִקְטַלְכוֹן	
	קָטַלְתְּכוֹן	קָטַלְנְכוֹן		מִקְטַלְהָ	
	קָטַלְתִּיהָ	קָטַלְנָהּ		מִקְטַלְהוֹן	
	קָטַלְתְּנוֹן	קָטַלְנָנוֹן			



REM. 1. Between the verbal form and the suffix, a נ (*Nun epenthetic*) is often inserted; e. g. יִקְטֹלֶנָּה, יִקְטֹלֶנָּה Dan. 2: 5, 9, or even an entire syllable נִי; e. g. יִקְטֹלֶנָּה, יִקְטֹלֶנָּה (Num. 16: 34), אֶפְקֹרֶנָּה, אֶפְקֹרֶנָּה Cant. 8: 2. Dan. 4: 1. 6: 16. Jer. 22: 4. Gen. 37: 27. Exod. 5: 3. Deut. 18: 18. Ps. 91: 16. 28: 3. Job 33: 33. Mich. 7: 9. Judg. 14: 13, etc. (peculiar in Ezra 7: 21 is יִשְׁאַלְנֶכָּוּ). This occurs as the prevailing usage in the *Fut.* (that is, in those persons of the *Fut.*, which terminate in the third stem-consonant), less frequently in the *Imper.* Prov. 4: 21 (קִטְּרוּן) and *Praet.*, e. g. Ps. 16: 7. Isa. 63: 9. Gen. 6: 2. Judg. 13: 1, 23. 2 Kings 20: 13. Job 41: 2. 1 Kings 18: 13. Josh. 24: 25. Num. 18: 11, and still less often in the *Infin.* Prov. 22: 21. Cant. 6: 11.

REM. 2. A ו *epenthetic* also occurs in the Targ. Prov.; e. g. חֲשֹׁבֶוּ, חֲשֹׁבֶוּ 4: 6, 8. 6: 24, unless any one should prefer, with Fürst (p. 195), to regard this ו as a fragment of the pronominal forms אִירָא (אִירָא), אִירָא, not, however, a very natural explanation.

## § 17.

### *Irregular Verb in general.*

1. The *irregular verbs* form, as in Hebrew, two principal classes, *verba defectiva* (*imperfecta*) and *quiescentia*. The irregularity affects, for the most part, only one stem-consonant; those which are anomalous in two of the consonants, are called *verba dupliciter imperfecta*, or *doubly anomalous*.

2. The *first* general class, the *verba defectiva*, embraces under it two kinds, namely verbs פִּן, as נִפֵּק, and עֵנ as סִבֵּב; the second general class, the *verba quiesc.*, contains four kinds, namely verbs פִּא, as אָכַל; פִּי, as יָרַע; עִי, as קִיָּם; and לִא, as מָצָא. The last named include at the same time those verbs, which exist separately in Hebrew as לָה.

## § 18.

### *Verbs* פִּן.

The irregularity of these verbs arises from the same causes as in Hebrew, and is in nearly all respects precisely the same.

1) The stem-consonant נ in the middle of a word, where it would terminate a mixed syllable, is *assimilated* to the following conso-

nant; e. g. מִפֶּס for מִפֶּס. 2) It falls entirely away in the *Imper. Peal*, where it would stand without a vowel at the beginning of the syllable פֶּס for נָפֶס, § 6. c. (yet see נָפֶל Jer. 25: 27). Further, as regards the vowels employed, the prevailing punctuation in the *Inf.* is מִפֶּס; and in the *Imp.*, is found פֶּס together with פִּיפֶּס or פֶּס even in verbs where no guttural occurs, fully as often as in others; e. g. פֶּס (as well as פֶּס), פֶּס; the further inflection of these forms proceeds generally as in פֶּסוּ, פֶּסוּ, פֶּסוּ Gen. 44: 17. Num. 16: 6. Josh. 9: 11. Isa. 56, 1, yet also פֶּסוּ Jer. 29: 6. The *Fut.* has - as often as י or - (י).

Of No. 1 there are various exceptions, not only in verbs, whose second stem-letter is a guttural, e. g. מִנְהוּם Isa. 5: 9, מִנְהוּר Prov. 29: 13 (on the contrary, מִנְהוּר is always inflected according to the above rule; e. g. *Fut.* מִנְהוּר for מִנְהוּר, *Aphel* מִנְהוּר), but also in other cases, e. g. מִנְהוּר, מִנְהוּר Dan. 2: 16. Ezra 7: 20, מִנְהוּר 4: 13, מִנְהוּר, מִנְהוּר Esth. 6: 13, מִנְהוּר Ps. 91: 7, מִנְהוּר, מִנְהוּר Ezra 5: 14 (even מִנְהוּר Job 15: 13) *Hoph.* מִנְהוּר Dan. 5: 20. This in Chaldee is the more easily explained, since here the resolution of the one form by the other, i. e. the substitution of נ for a doubling of the initial consonant of the verb, had become not an uncommon usage of the language. In some verbs, the regular and the assimilated forms exist together; e. g. מִנְהוּר, מִנְהוּר Num. 6: 5. Forms like מִנְהוּר instead of מִנְהוּר, except in connection with a guttural, are infrequent, and are found only in ed. Ven.; e. g. מִנְהוּר, מִנְהוּר. In respect to the manner in which verbs פִּנ pass into the inflection of verbs פִּי, as also the reverse, see § 20. 4.

The verb מִנְהוּר has in the *Fut.*, as its characteristic vowel -; e. g. מִנְהוּר Exod. 25: 16, מִנְהוּר Deut. 21: 8. In the biblical Chaldee, the full form occurs instead of this: מִנְהוּר (see above), once even מִנְהוּר Dan. 2: 16.

			Peal.	Aphel.	Ittaphal.
<i>Praet.</i>	3. <i>m.</i>		נִפֵּק	אִפֵּק	אִתִּפֵּק
	3. <i>f.</i>		נִפְּקָה	אִפְּקָה	אִתִּפְּקָה
	2. <i>m.</i>		נִפְּקֶה	אִפְּקֶה	אִתִּפְּקֶה
	2. <i>f.</i>		נִפְּקִי	אִפְּקִי	אִתִּפְּקִי
	1. <i>c.</i>		נִפְּקֶה	אִפְּקֶה	אִתִּפְּקֶה
<i>Plur.</i>	3. <i>m.</i>		נִפְּקוּ	אִפְּקוּ	אִתִּפְּקוּ
	3. <i>f.</i>	⚡	נִפְּקִי	אִפְּקִי	אִתִּפְּקִי
	2. <i>m.</i>		נִפְּקֶתוּ	אִפְּקֶתוּ	אִתִּפְּקֶתוּ
	2. <i>f.</i>		נִפְּקֶתֶן	אִפְּקֶתֶן	אִתִּפְּקֶתֶן
	1. <i>c.</i>		נִפְּקֶנָּה	אִפְּקֶנָּה	אִתִּפְּקֶנָּה
<i>Infin.</i>			מִפֵּק	אִפְּקָא	אִתִּפְּקָא
<i>Imp.</i>	<i>m.</i>		פֵּק, פִּק	אִפֵּק	אִתִּפֵּק
	<i>f.</i>		פִּקִּי	אִפְּקִי	אִתִּפְּקִי
<i>Plur.</i>	<i>m.</i>		פִּקוּ, פִּקִּי	אִפְּקוּ	אִתִּפְּקוּ
	<i>f.</i>		פִּקְנָה	אִפְּקֶנָּה	אִתִּפְּקֶנָּה
<i>Fut.</i>	3. <i>m.</i>		יִפֵּק, יִפֵּק	יִפֵּק	יִתִּפֵּק
	3. <i>f.</i>		תִּפֵּק, תִּפֵּק	תִּפֵּק	תִּתִּפֵּק
	2. <i>m.</i>		תִּפֵּק, תִּפֵּק	תִּפֵּק	תִּתִּפֵּק
	2. <i>f.</i>		תִּפְּקִי	תִּפְּקִי	תִּתִּפְּקִי
	1. <i>c.</i>		אִפֵּק, אִפֵּק	אִפֵּק	אִתִּפֵּק
<i>Plur.</i>	3. <i>m.</i>		יִפְּקוּ	יִפְּקוּ	יִתִּפְּקוּ
	3. <i>f.</i>		יִפְּקוּ	יִפְּקוּ	יִתִּפְּקוּ
	2. <i>m.</i>		תִּפְּקוּ	תִּפְּקוּ	תִּתִּפְּקוּ
	2. <i>f.</i>		תִּפְּקוּ	תִּפְּקוּ	תִּתִּפְּקוּ
	1. <i>c.</i>		נִיפֵּק, נִיפֵּק	נִיפֵּק	נִיתִפֵּק
1. <i>Part.</i>	{ <i>m.</i>		נִיפֵּק	מִיפֵּק	מִיתִפֵּק
	{ <i>f.</i>		נִיפְּקָה	מִיפְּקָה	מִיתִפְּקָה
2. <i>Part.</i>	{ <i>m.</i>		נִיפִּיק	מִיפֵּק	
	{ <i>f.</i>		נִיפְּקִי	מִיפְּקָה	



§ 19.

*Verbs עב or ע doubled.*

1. The anomalies of these verbs, which are parallel only in part to those in Hebrew, are such as the following :

1) The body of these verbs, in the ground-form, consists of two letters, and has, therefore, the characteristic vowel under the first radical, דָּק. The reduplication of the second radical in *Peal* appears only in the two participles דָּקֵק, דָּקֵק, very seldom in the inflexion of the *Praet.*; e. g. וְלָלַח Gen. 16: 4. Jon., וְנָדְדָה Job 7: 4, וְנָדָה Esth. 6: 1). On the contrary, a) in the forms of the *Praet.* and *Imp. Peal*, whose sufformative begins with a vowel, the second radical is sharpened by a *Dag. forte*, as דָּקָה, דָּקִי, דָּקִי (עוֹלָה Joel 1: 13); only in a few instances is the vowel lengthened instead of this, producing forms which coincide with עוֹ; e. g. דָּקִי for דָּקִי Dan. 2: 35 and עָלָה for עָלָה Gen. 7: 9. Jon. b) Elsewhere the reduplication is thrown back upon the first stem-consonant; e. g. אָדָּק, אָדָּק, אָדָּק (in the *Fut.* and *Inf. Peal* and throughout *Aphel*), or appears in a prolongation of the vowel under the preformative, as רָבֹו, רָבֹו, Deut. 20: 14. 15: 19. The latter takes place of course regularly, when the first radical is a guttural: e. g. רָעֹו Ps. 2: 12, רָעֹו Isa. 26: 2 (רָעֹו Num. 5: 22. 8: 15), רָעֹו Prov. 23: 12, אָעֹו Cant. 2: 5). [Sometimes the *Dag. forte* is resolved into נ; e. g. הָנָעַל Dan. 2: 21. 4: 3. Gen. 19: 10. Jon.].

*Aphel* of the verb רָבָה has the form אֲרָבָהּ (with the suffix), Deut. 1: 15. Jon. as if from a verb פָּר.

2. Instead of *Paël* and *Ithpaal*, which are formed regularly (see Dan. 4: 10. 7: 20. Ps. 35: 15. 42: 7), *Palpel* and *Ithpalpal* (e. g. אֲדָקֵק, אֲדָקֵק Job 9: 17. 30: 14. Isa. 21: 9, אֲתָקֵק, אֲתָקֵק Isa. 3: 12. Jer. 49: 7, אֲתָמָמָה Gen. 33: 4. Jon.), or *Poal* and *Ithpoal* (e. g. אֲתָקֵל Gen. 8: 8. Jon., אֲתָרֹוּפָה Job 9: 6) are mostly in use.

The participles of *Peal*, as has been already remarked above, are generally inflected with a reduplication of the last consonant; comp. Isa. 58: 4. Ps. 72: 6. 1 Sam. 25: 4. Jer. 22: 7. Yet the active participle often occurs in the form דָּקֵק derived from עִי, or דָּקָה Jer. 10: 3.

Ps. 57: 7. 58: 9. The *Peil* appears once in the form נִקֵּץ (according to 1. b.) Exod. 32: 20.

The *Ithpeal*, likewise, is found reduplicated אֶחָבִיוּ, Hos. 8: 8. Isa. 24: 3. אֶחָבִיוּ Amos 7: 1. Jer. 50: 27. Isa. 24: 3; but sometimes (with an approach to עו) אֶחָחַל Isa. 53: 5. Lev. 16: 27.

From the biblical Chaldee are to be further adduced, as Hebraizing forms: Aph. חִדְקוּ Dan. 6: 25 מִחְדַּק Dan. 2: 40, הִעֲלִי Dan. 2: 24, Hoph. הִעֲלִי Dan. 5: 13, 17.

		Peal.	Aphel.	Ittaphal.
<i>Praet.</i>	3. m.	דָּק	אֲדַק	אִתְּדַק
	3. f.	דָּקַת	אֲדַקַת	אִתְּדַקַת
	2. m.	דָּקַתָּ, דִּקְתָּ	אֲדַקְתָּ	אִתְּדַקְתָּ
	2. f.	דָּקַתְּ	אֲדַקְתְּ	אִתְּדַקְתְּ
	1. c.	דָּקַתְּ	אֲדַקַתְּ	אִתְּדַקַתְּ
<i>Plur.</i>	3. m.	דָּקוּ	אֲדַקוּ	אִתְּדַקוּ
	3. f.	דָּקְנָא	אֲדַקְנָא	אִתְּדַקְנָא
	2. m.	דָּקְתוּן	אֲדַקְתוּן	אִתְּדַקְתוּן
	2. f.	דָּקְתוּן	אֲדַקְתוּן	אִתְּדַקְתוּן
	1. c.	דָּקְנָא	אֲדַקְנָא	אִתְּדַקְנָא
<i>Infin.</i>		מִדֵּק	אֲדַקָא	אִתְּדַקָא
<i>Imp.</i>	2. m.	דֵּק	אֲדַק	אִתְּדַק
	2. f.	דֵּקִי	אֲדַקִי	אִתְּדַקִי
<i>Plur.</i>	2. m.	דֵּקוּ	אֲדַקוּ	אִתְּדַקוּ
	2. f.	דֵּקְנָא	אֲדַקְנָא	אִתְּדַקְנָא
<i>Fut.</i>	3. m.	יִדֵּק	יִדַּק	יִתְּדַק
	3. f.	יִדַּקַת	יִדַּקַת	יִתְּדַקַת
	2. m.	יִדַּקְתָּ	יִדַּקְתָּ	יִתְּדַקְתָּ
	2. f.	יִדַּקְתְּ	יִדַּקְתְּ	יִתְּדַקְתְּ
	1. c.	יִדַּקְתְּ	יִדַּקְתְּ	יִתְּדַקְתְּ
<i>Plur.</i>	3. m.	יִדַּקוּן	יִדַּקוּן	יִתְּדַקוּן
	3. f.	יִדַּקְנָא	יִדַּקְנָא	יִתְּדַקְנָא
	2. m.	יִדַּקְתוּן	יִדַּקְתוּן	יִתְּדַקְתוּן
	2. f.	יִדַּקְתוּן	יִדַּקְתוּן	יִתְּדַקְתוּן
	1. c.	יִדַּקְנָא	יִדַּקְנָא	יִתְּדַקְנָא
1. Part.	{ m.	דִּקְקָא	מִדֵּק	מִתְּדַק
	{ f.	דִּקְקָא	מִדֵּקָא	מִתְּדַקָא
2. Part.	{ m.	דִּקְקִי	מִדֵּק	
	{ f.	דִּקְקִיא	מִדֵּקָא	



## § 20.

*Verbs* פִּי (פִּי).

1. Verbs which in the ground-form have פִּי for their first radical (יָדַע, יָדַשׁ, יָלִיד, § 12. 2, 1), are also in Chaldee of three kinds; namely, verbs properly פִּי, verbs originally פִּי, and finally those in which the פִּי is not treated as a *quiescent*, but assimilated after the manner of verbs פִּי.

2. Verbs פִּי, which compose the greater number, a) cast off the first stem-consonant in the *Imper. Peal* (which commonly takes the vowel פִּי, less frequently פִּי), e. g. יָדַע from יָדַע, יָדַב from יָדַב; b) In the *Fut. Peal*, they allow Yodh to quiesce in פִּי, and the last syllable then receives the characteristic vowel פִּי or פִּי (with a guttural פִּי), e. g. יָלִיד, יָלִידָה (according to § 6., the quiescent פִּי is often omitted here in writing; e. g. Prov. 11: 25. Ps. 104: 4. Job 3: 4); c) They resume their original פִּי, throughout the third Conj. where it quiesces in Hholem; e. g. אוֹסִיף, אוֹסִיף, *Fut.* יוֹסִיף, *Ittaph.* אוֹסִיף.

The *Ittaph.* אוֹסִיף, as well as the whole second conjugation (יָדַב, יָדַב, יָדַב), is for the most part regular, except only that in the latter, some verbs take also פִּי as the first stem-letter; e. g. יָדַב Prov. 10: 2, יָדַב Ps. 88: 13, יָדַב Eccl. 9: 3. In *Aphel*, forms with פִּי after the *preform. Fut.* and *Part.* are not uncommon; in יָדַע occur even regularly יָדַע Dan. 2: 15. Ps. 77: 15, and יָדַע Ps. 16: 11. 1 Sam. 14: 12, etc.

3. In verbs פִּי, the first radical quiesces, a) in the *Fut. Peal* commonly in פִּי; e. g. יָדַב 2 Kings 1: 14. Ps. 102: 12 (on the contrary, יָדַב Isa. 7: 18); b) In *Aphel*, in פִּי; e. g. יָדַב Ps. 49: 19. Jer. 10: 5. Mich. 1: 8. Less frequently is פִּי movable: comp. יָדַב. From that form of *Aphel* now would arise an *Ittaph.* like יָדַב; but in all the passages adduced by Fürst, p. 177 (Isa. 50: 13. 62: 5. Jer. 49: 33), the punctuation is uncertain, and the text of the polyglotts has *Ittaph.* or *Ittaph.*

But the distinction between these two classes of verbs is not so strictly maintained, that the forms (particularly of *Aphel*) are not often interchanged with each other. Thus with יָדַב coexists also יָדַב Gen. 17: 16, with יָדַב also יָדַב Ps. 66: 6, with יָדַב also יָדַב; and יָדַב, which in Hebrew is פִּי, makes in *Aph.* יָדַב.

The Paradigm of verbs פו and פו is, accordingly, as follows:

		פו VERBS	פו VERBS
<i>Peal.</i>	<i>Praeter.</i> 3. <i>p.</i>	וּלְחַד, וּלְחַד	וּלְחַד, וּלְחַד
	1. <i>p.</i>	וּלְחַד etc.	וּלְחַד etc.
	<i>Imper.</i>	חַב	חַב (חַיב)
	<i>Inf.</i>	מִיֻּלַּד	
	<i>Fut.</i>	יִלְחַד	יִיטַב
	<i>Part.</i>	וּלְחַד, וּלְחַד	
<i>Ithpeel.</i>	<i>Praet.</i>	אֶחָלֵד (אֶחָלֵד)	
<i>Paël.</i>	<i>Praet.</i>	יֻלַּד	יֻטַּב
	<i>Fut.</i>	יִלְחַד	יִיטַב
<i>Ithpaal.</i>	<i>Praet.</i>	אֶחָלֵד	
<i>Aphel.</i>	<i>Praet.</i>	אֶחָלֵד	אֶיטַב
	<i>Fut.</i>	יִלְחַד	יִיטַב

4. A number of verbs of this class assimilate their י to the following consonant in the *Inf.* and *Fut.* *Peal*, as well as in *Aphel*, and are in this respect, therefore, not different from verbs פן. This is exemplified not only in *Aphel* יָצַע, אָפִיחַ *Aphel* יָנַח Deut. 34: 6. Jon., אָפִיקָה *Aphel* יָקָה, but in particular forms of יָדַע, *Inf.* מָדַע Gen. 15: 13, *Fut.* יִדַּע 1 Sam. 20: 30 (even יִנָּדַע Isa. 4: 15. Dan. 2: 9) at the same time יָדַע, *Inf.* יָדַע Ps. 133: 1, *Fut.* יִדַּע Deut. 8: 12. 1 Sam. 22: 5. 2 Sam. 16: 18, יָכַל *Inf.* מָכַל Num. 13: 31, *Fut.* יִכַּל Ezek. 7: 19. Dan. 3: 29.

§ 21.

Verbs פא.

Verbs פא are treated not only as guttural verbs (§ 15), but at the same time as *quiescents*; a) Most of them allow the א in the *Fut.* and *Inf.* *Peal* to quiesce in א; e. g. יָאֵבַל Dan. 7: 23, יָאֵבַר Jer. 10: 11, יָאֵבַר Dan. 2: 7, יָאֵבַר Dan. 2: 9, and in addition to this, change it commonly into י; e. g. יָיָבַל Gen. 2: 16. 24: 33, Exod. 2: 20. Lev. 19: 16, יָיָבַל Job 16: 6, יָיָבַל Deut. 18: 9, יָיָבַר Gen. 30: 16. 21: 30. 1 Sam. 23: 26. Judg. 15: 12. Josh. 7: 12;

but throughout *Aphel* they change it into ו; e. g. אוֹבֵד, אוֹבֵל, *Fut.* יוֹבֵל, יוֹנִיס, יוֹהוֹבֵד, יוֹהוֹבֵד, Dan. 2: 24, *Infin.* אוֹבְדָא, *Particip.* מוֹבִיד, מוֹרֶה, Deut. 8: 20. Mich. 5: 7 (peculiar is אִיבֵל Deut. 32: 13. Jon. and T. H., as also מוֹהֲרִין (Syr.) Prov. 23: 30. A *Hophal* הוֹבֵד occurs Dan. 7: 11. b) אבד, אלה, אסא prefer in the *Fut.* and *Part.* Paël the contracted form אֵאלֶה, מֵאֵלֶה, from which א commonly falls out; comp. אֵלֶיהָ Deut. 5: 31, הֵלְפֹן Isa. 30: 10, מֵלֶיהָ Dan. 4: 1, מַיִר 2 Kings 20: 5. c) Some omit the א also in *Ithpaal*, its vowel being transferred to the preformative which receives then *Dag. forte*; e. g. אֶתְנַפֵּר for אֶתְנַפֵּר (אֶתְנַפֵּר) 1 Sam. 2: 5. Ezek. 47: 11.

אמן, in the third conjugation, takes the Hebrew form הִתְאַמֵּן (הִתְאַמֵּן), יִתְאַמֵּן, יִתְאַמֵּן Gen. 15: 16. Job 4: 8. 15: 22. A passive form יִתְהַמֵּן occurs Gen. 42: 20. — Respecting אֶתְנַפֵּר, see § 24. 2.

In addition to the forms above explained, are sometimes found others also, in which the quiescence has not taken place; thus with מוֹרֶה occurs at the same time מוֹרֶה Eccl. 7: 17.

## § 22.

### Verbs עו (עו).

For the *verba quiescentis* ע, i. e. verbs whose middle stem-letter quiesces, the type of the *verba* עו is usually employed in Chaldee throughout their whole inflection (with a few exceptions). A still greater interchange of verbs עו and עו takes place in Chaldee than in Hebrew. The following particulars are to be remarked:

1. In the first conjugation (with the exception of the *Part. Benoni*), and the third, the stem of these verbs appears throughout as monosyllabic: קם, מָקם, אָקם, and we can scarcely doubt, that this is the original form (Fürst, p. 157 sq.). The preformatives of the *Fut.* and *Inf.* of both conjugations receive usually ַ, though in the later Targums they have also (in *Peal*) not unfrequently ַ or ַ (עַ); e. g. אָמַת Ruth 1: 17, אָמַת Gen. 27: 4, אִיתוֹב Exod. 4: 18, מִימַת Gen. 2: 17. 27: 5, מִדֵּן Joel 3: 12, מָקם Num. 16: 9, מִיקָם Gen. 3: 18. Jon. (peculiar is הָהָ *Fut. Peal* from הוֹהָ Ezra 5: 5. 6: 5; comp. Gen. 20: 13. Jon.). The active *Participle* appears constantly with two syllables, as קָמם or קָאם (like קָמַל).



*Aphel* has sometimes, in the later Targums, the form of the verbs פִּי; e. g. אוֹפִיר, אוֹפִיר Ps. 37: 24. 53: 3. 78: 13. Gen. 18: 16. 19: 28. Jon. Prov. 22: 7, and still another variety אִפְרִי Lev. 1: 1. Jon. In other places, the punctuation fluctuates between אִפְרִי and אִפְרִי Deut. 11: 4. Exod. 16: 18. Jon. Dan. 5: 19. The Participle is unusual as it appears in מִפִּיר Judg. 20: 33., מִפִּיר Jer. 8: 6.; in the biblical Chaldee occurs once מִפְּרִי Dan. 2: 21. The *Inf. Peal* has sometimes the form מִפִּיר or מִפִּיר Ps. 69: 3. Exod. 4: 21. Jon.

2. In *Ithpeal*, the first radical is pronounced with  $\dot{\text{p}}$  or  $\text{p}$ , and the  $\text{p}$  of the prefixed syllable is doubled,<sup>1</sup> אֶתְּפֶלֶס, אֶתְּפֶלֶס. Occasionally, the principal syllable has  $\text{p}$ ; e. g. אֶתְּפֶלֶס Jer. 33: 22. Gen. 38: 26. (T. H.) Dan. 4: 9.

3. *Paël* and *Ithpaal* are formed as in אָהָב, אֶהְיֶה, and are inflected regularly (אֶהְיֶה, אֶהְיֶה, Num. 14: 38. Hab. 2: 4; on the contrary, אֶהְיֶה, Imp. אֶהְיֶה Ezek. 20: 25. Jer. 27: 17; comp. also קָמָה Exod. 6: 8). For these conjugations, however, many verbs employ the reduplicated form of the *Poël* קָמָה or *Palpel* קָמָה with their Passives. The *Ittaphal* occurs only in the contracted form אֶהְיֶה (i. e. אֶהְיֶה) or אֶהְיֶה; yet in printed texts, the *Ithpeal* and *Ittaphal* are often interchanged.

4. The following verbs are inflected as אָי :  
*a*) כִּירַם , מְרֵא , רָחַץ : עָלַה in *Pael*, where the *Praet.* is declined : סָבַח , שָׁכַח , פָּסַח  
 מִיתָה , מִיתוּ etc. Gen. 27: 1. 35:19. Exod. 4: 19. Prov. 23:  
 22. 1 Sam. 12: 2. The *Imp.* שָׂמַח , שָׂמַח Ezra 4: 21. The *Fut.*  
 יֶזְעַק Deut. 15: 6. — *b*) בִּין , in *Ithpeal* where it makes fully אֲתֻבֵּן  
 or contracted אֹתֵבֶן Job 11: 12. 23: 5. 37: 14. Prov. 1: 2.

REM. Those verbs which have ו movable for the middle radical, do not, of course belong here, but are regular in their inflection; e. g. דָּנַל, דָּנָה, דָּנָה, דָּנָה, דָּנָה, דָּנָה, etc. Their number is greater in Chaldee than in Hebrew. Some verbs of this class exist at the same time with verbs עו quiescent, and have then a different signification from the latter; e. g. חָוַר to view, חָוַר to be white, שָׁוַת to sink down, שָׁוַת to sprout.

<sup>1</sup> Fürst, p. 164, rejects this reduplication; but its reality seems to be confirmed by the fact, that the ה of the prefixed syllable in the *Ithpeal* of these verbs is never inserted after the sibilants; see § 10, 5. Indeed, Fürst himself has dagheshed these forms in his Concordance; comp. יתְּחַיֶּה p. 349. The repetition serves here to strengthen the syllable; as in, יִדְּקֶה, מִדְּקֶה, and the like.

	Peal.	Ithpeal.	Paël.	Ithpaal.
<i>Praet.</i> 3. m.	קָם	אֶתְקָם	קָיִם	אֶתְקָיִם
3. f.	קָמַת	אֶתְקַמַת	קָיְמַת	אֶתְקַיְמַת
2. m.	קָמַת, קָמֶתָ	אֶתְקַמַת	קָיְמַת	אֶתְקַיְמַת
2. f.	קָמַת	אֶתְקַמַת	קָיְמַת	אֶתְקַיְמַת
1. c.	קָמַת	אֶתְקַמַת	קָיְמַת	אֶתְקַיְמַת
<i>Plur.</i> 3. m.	קָמוּ	אֶתְקָמוּ	קָיְמוּ	אֶתְקַיְמוּ
3. f.	קָמָא	אֶתְקָמָא	קָיְמָא	אֶתְקַיְמָא
2. m.	קָמַתוֹן, קָמֶתוֹן	אֶתְקַמַתוֹן	קָיְמַתוֹן	אֶתְקַיְמַתוֹן
2. f.	קָמַתֶּן, קָמֶתֶן	אֶתְקַמַתֶּן	קָיְמַתֶּן	אֶתְקַיְמַתֶּן
1. c.	קָמַנָא, קָמֶנָא	אֶתְקָמַנָא	קָיְמַנָא	אֶתְקַיְמַנָא
<i>Infinitive.</i>	מָקָם (מְקוֹם)	אֶתְקַמָא	קָיְמָא	אֶתְקַיְמָא
<i>Imp.</i> 2. m.	קוּם	אֶתְקָם	קָיִם	אֶתְקָיִם
2. f.	קוּמִי	אֶתְקָמִי	קָיְמִי	אֶתְקָיְמִי
<i>Plur.</i> 2. m.	קוּמוּ	אֶתְקָמוּ	קָיְמוּ	אֶתְקָיְמוּ
2. f.	קוּמַנָא	אֶתְקָמַנָא	קָיְמַנָא	אֶתְקַיְמַנָא
<i>Fut.</i> 3. m.	יָקוּם	יֶתְקָם	יָקִים	יֶתְקָיִם
3. f.	תָּקוּם	תֶּתְקָם	תָּקִים	תֶּתְקָיִם
2. m.	תָּקוּם	תֶּתְקָם	תָּקִים	תֶּתְקָיִם
2. f.	תָּקוּמִין	תֶּתְקָמִין	תָּקִימִין	תֶּתְקָיְמִין
1. c.	אָקוּם	אֶתְקָם	אָקִים	אֶתְקָיִם
<i>Plur.</i> 3. m.	יָקוּמוּן	יֶתְקָמוּן	יָקִימוּן	יֶתְקָיְמוּן
3. f.	יָקוּמַן	יֶתְקָמַן	יָקִימַן	יֶתְקָיְמַן
2. m.	תָּקוּמוֹן	תֶּתְקָמוֹן	תָּקִימוֹן	תֶּתְקָיְמוֹן
2. f.	תָּקוּמֶן	תֶּתְקָמֶן	תָּקִימֶן	תֶּתְקָיְמֶן
1. c.	נָקוּם	נֶתְקָם	נָקִים	נֶתְקָיִם
1. Part. { m.	קָאִם, קָיִם	מֶתְקָם	מָקִים	מֶתְקָיִם
1. Part. { f.	קָיְמָא	מֶתְקָמָא	מָקִימָא	מֶתְקַיְמָא
2. Part. { m.	קִים		מָקִים	
2. Part. { f.	קָיְמָא		מָקִימָא	

Aphel.	Ittaphal.	Poël.	Ithpoal.
אֶתְקוּמִם	אֶתְקִימִם	קוּמִם	אֶתְקוּמִם
אֶתְקוּמְמַת	אֶתְקִימְמַת	קוּמְמַת	אֶתְקוּמְמַת
אֶתְקוּמְמַת	אֶתְקִימְמַת	קוּמְמַת	אֶתְקוּמְמַת
אֶתְקוּמְמַת	אֶתְקִימְמַת	קוּמְמַת	אֶתְקוּמְמַת
אֶתְקוּמְמַת	אֶתְקִימְמַת	קוּמְמַת	אֶתְקוּמְמַת
אֶתְקוּמְמוֹ	אֶתְקִימוֹ	קוּמְמוֹ	אֶתְקוּמְמוֹ
אֶתְקוּמְמָא	אֶתְקִימָא	קוּמְמָא	אֶתְקוּמְמָא
אֶתְקוּמְמַתוֹן	אֶתְקִימְמַתוֹן	קוּמְמַתוֹן	אֶתְקוּמְמַתוֹן
אֶתְקוּמְמַתוֹן	אֶתְקִימְמַתוֹן	קוּמְמַתוֹן	אֶתְקוּמְמַתוֹן
אֶתְקוּמְמַנָּא	אֶתְקִימְמַנָּא	קוּמְמַנָּא	אֶתְקוּמְמַנָּא
אֶתְקוּמְמָא	אֶתְקִימְמָא	קוּמְמָא	אֶתְקוּמְמָא
אֶתְקוּמִם	אֶתְקִימִם	קוּמִם	אֶתְקוּמִם
אֶתְקוּמְמִי	אֶתְקִימְמִי	קוּמְמִי	אֶתְקוּמְמִי
אֶתְקוּמְמוֹ	אֶתְקִימוֹ	קוּמְמוֹ	אֶתְקוּמְמוֹ
אֶתְקוּמְמַנָּא	אֶתְקִימְמַנָּא	קוּמְמַנָּא	אֶתְקוּמְמַנָּא
יִתְקוּמִם	יִתְקִימִם	יְקוּמִם	יִתְקוּמִם
יִתְקוּמִם	יִתְקִימִם	יְקוּמִם	יִתְקוּמִם
יִתְקוּמִם	יִתְקִימִם	יְקוּמִם	יִתְקוּמִם
יִתְקוּמְמִין	יִתְקִימְמִין	יְקוּמְמִין	יִתְקוּמְמִין
יִתְקוּמִם	יִתְקִימִם	יְקוּמִם	יִתְקוּמִם
יִתְקוּמְמוֹן	יִתְקִימְמוֹן	יְקוּמְמוֹן	יִתְקוּמְמוֹן
יִתְקוּמְמִין	יִתְקִימְמִין	יְקוּמְמִין	יִתְקוּמְמִין
יִתְקוּמְמוֹן	יִתְקִימְמוֹן	יְקוּמְמוֹן	יִתְקוּמְמוֹן
יִתְקוּמְמִין	יִתְקִימְמִין	יְקוּמְמִין	יִתְקוּמְמִין
נִתְקוּמִם	נִתְקִימִם	נְקוּמִם	נִתְקוּמִם
מִתְקוּמִם	מִתְקִימִם	מְקוּמִם	מִתְקוּמִם
מִתְקוּמְמָא	מִתְקִימְמָא	מְקוּמְמָא	מִתְקוּמְמָא
מִתְקוּמִם	מִתְקִימִם	מְקוּמִם	מִתְקוּמִם
מִתְקוּמְמָא	מִתְקִימְמָא	מְקוּמְמָא	מִתְקוּמְמָא



## § 23.

*Verbs* לָא (לִי).

These comprehend the two classes of verbs which are distinguished in Hebrew as לָא and לִי, the difference between which has disappeared here, as well as in Syriac. The stem terminates regularly, in biblical Chaldee, in א־, more rarely in ה־ (Dan. 2: 16. 4: 8. 6: 3); in the Targums, on the contrary, particularly the later of them, it terminates uniformly in י־ or י־, so that with reference to their mode of inflection, these verbs might perhaps, with more propriety, be denominated לִי.

It is very seldom that a ה occurs in the Targums as the third stem-consonant of the ground-form; comp., however, מִנְהָ Num. 5: 26.

1. As now י has a tendency to take the place of א even in the ground-form, so in the inflection also of these verbs it maintains the decided ascendancy as final stem-consonant. As regards those forms which terminate in the third (quiescent) radical, it may be observed that א and י appear with equal frequency in the *Inf.* and *Partic. Peal* (אֶמְרָא together with מְרָרִי, קָרָא together with קָרִי); on the contrary, in all the other formations י is predominant; e. g. רִגְלִי, גִּלְי, אֶגְלִי etc. But י quiesces regularly in the *Fut.*, *Imper.*, *Inf.*, and *Partic. act.* of *Peal* in י־; in the other conjugations, in י־.

As less common may be mentioned, a) א instead of י in *lithpeal* Isa. 53: 2. Prov. 6: 6, in *lithpaal* Jer. 23: 25. Prov. 18: 9. — b) י־ in the several conjugations except *Peal*; e. g. Ps. 78: 11. 2 Kings 8: 8 (*Aphel*) — c) י־ in *Imp. Peal* occurs almost as often as the other form, Deut. 31: 14. Dan. 5: 4. Ps. 45: 1. 1 Sam. 25: 25.

2. In the personal inflection with sufformatives, a trace of the א appears but seldom; viz. the third sing. fem. *Praet. Peal* גִּלְתִּי, the third pl. masc. *Praet.* and second pl. masc. *Imper.* גִּלְוּ, גִּלְוּ, the second fem. pl. *Imper.* אֶתְגִּלְנָא, גִּלְנָא, גִּלְנָא, the forms of the *Fut.* in יִגְלִי and יִגְלִי, as יִתְגִּלְנָא, יִתְגִּלְנָא, point to an absorbed א (גִּלְתָּא), which is still written in the common form of the *Imp. Peal* גִּלְתָּא; on the contrary, the third pl. *Praet. Peal* גִּלְתָּא and the *Inf.* גִּלְתָּא, גִּלְתָּא etc., according to an analogy found elsewhere (גִּלְתָּא, גִּלְתָּא), come more probably from גִּלְי.

3. י is decidedly retained as third stem-consonant; *a*) As *quiescent* before sufformatives of the first and second sing. and plur. Praet., as well as in the third plur. masc. Praet. (גָּלִיו, אֶגְלִיו, גְּלִיתָ, גְּלִיתָ, אֶגְלִיתָ, גְּלִיתָ — *b*) As *movable* before sufformatives of all the Futures in יָ, as יִגְלֶה, יִגְלֶה, יִגְלֶה, in the third fem. sing. Praet. גְּלִיתָ, אֶגְלִיתָ, and here even doubled אֶגְלִיתָ, in forms of the Infinitive מְגַלֵּה, אֶגְלִיה, in the other (more frequent) inflection of the second sing. Praet. גְּלִיתָ, גְּלִיתָ, finally in the second Participle of *Peal* and *Aphel* מְגַלֵּה, מְגַלֵּה.

4. A double mode of formation is clearly apparent in several forms, namely in *Peal* in third plur. Praet. גָּלוּ and גְּלוּ, and גְּלִיָּה and גְּלִיָּה, and third plur. masc. Praet. of the other Conjug., גְּלִיו and גְּלִיו, אֶגְלִיו and אֶגְלִיו, which latter forms occur frequently even in *Onkelos*; the fluctuation between יָ and יָ (see above) imports less in consequence of the present low condition of the punctuation. That difference may indeed have some connection with the original distinction between verbs לֹא and לִי (as very many of the latter kind still exist in Arabic); but it is preserved here in scarcely a single verb throughout, and it must appear very fanciful to divide the verbs לֹא transmitted to us in Chaldee, with reference to their inflection, into verbs with final *a* and *i* sounds, as Fürst has attempted to do, though not without some ingenuity (§ 164 sq.)

As regards particular examples, the explanation of גְּלִיתָ, גְּלִיתָ, which Fürst gives, in order to refer them back to a final *a*, is improbable. Why should the sufformative of the first person in these verbs have been יָ? In the regular verb יָ exists already, and from this arises very easily גְּלִיָּה, גְּלִיָּה. And why in verbs whose final sound was *a*, did not the language produce such formations as גְּלִיָּה, גְּלִיָּה, which would so readily have presented themselves, and which occur in Hebrew? It is far more simple in the forms גְּלִיָּה, גְּלִיָּה, to regard יָ as the third stem-consonant.

Verbs with ה movable as third radical, as גָּבַהּ, תָּהַה, תָּהַה etc. are of course entirely regular in their inflection; e. g. תָּהַה Jer. 36: 16, *Fut.* יִתְהַה Job 37: 1, *Ilthpeal* תִּתְהַה Eccl. 1: 12. (*Hiph.* תִּתְהַה in the Talm.).

לֹה, from a verb לֹה with ה movable as second stem-letter, forms its *Aphel* אֶלְהִי 2 Kings 3: 34, *Schaphel* שְׁלִי Job 16: 7. Isa. 44: 12, *Isch-taph.* אֶשְׁתְּלִי Ps. 102: 1. Job 4: 1 (אֶשְׁתְּלִי Ps. 68: 10).

	Peal.	Ithpael.
<i>Pr. 3. m.</i>	גָּלַא (סָגִי) סָגִי	אֶתְגָּלִי (יִי)
<i>3. f.</i>	גָּלַח סָגִיָּא, סָגִית גָּלַח	אֶתְגָּלִית (יֵאֵת)
<i>2. m.</i>	גָּלִית, גָּלִיתָ	אֶתְגָּלִית
<i>2. f.</i>	גָּלִית, גָּלִיתָ	אֶתְגָּלִית
<i>1. c.</i>	גָּלִיתִי, גָּלִיתָ	אֶתְגָּלִיתִי
<i>Pl. 3. m.</i>	גָּלוּ סָגִיָּאוּ, סָגִיו	אֶתְגָּלִיו (יֵאֻנוּ)
<i>3. f.</i>	גָּלָאָה סָגִיָּאָה	אֶתְגָּלִיָּא
<i>2. m.</i>	גָּלִיתוּן סָגִיתוּן	אֶתְגָּלִיתוּן
<i>2. f.</i>	גָּלִיתְנָן סָגִיתְנָן	אֶתְגָּלִיתְנָן
<i>1. c.</i>	גָּלִינוּא סָגִינוּא	אֶתְגָּלִינוּא
<i>Infin. (מְגָלִיָּה, מְגָלָא)</i>		אֶתְגָּלָא
<i>Imp. m.</i>	גָּלִי (גָּלַא), גָּלִי	אֶתְגָּלַא
<i>f.</i>	גָּלִי, גָּלִי	אֶתְגָּלִי
<i>Plur. m.</i>	גָּלוּ	אֶתְגָּלוּ
<i>f.</i>	גָּלָאָנָה, גָּלְנָן	אֶתְגָּלָנָה
<i>Fut. 3. m.</i>	יִגָּלַא (יִי)	יִתְגָּלִי (אֵא)
<i>3. f.</i>	יִתְגָּלַא (יִי)	יִתְגָּלִי (אֵא)
<i>2. m.</i>	יִתְגָּלַא (יִי)	יִתְגָּלִי (אֵא)
<i>2. f.</i>	יִתְגָּלִין	יִתְגָּלִין
<i>1. c.</i>	אִגָּלַא (יִי)	אֶתְגָּלִי (אֵא)
<i>Pl. 3. m.</i>	יִגָּלֻן	יִתְגָּלֻן
<i>3. f.</i>	יִתְגָּלִין	יִתְגָּלִין
<i>2. m.</i>	יִתְגָּלֻן	יִתְגָּלֻן
<i>2. f.</i>	יִתְגָּלִין	יִתְגָּלִין
<i>1. c.</i>	נִגָּלַא (יִי)	נִתְגָּלִי (אֵא)
<i>1. P. {</i>	<i>m.</i> גָּלַא, גָּלִי	מִתְגָּלִי
<i>f.</i>	גָּלִיָּא	מִתְגָּלִיָּא
<i>2. P. {</i>	<i>m.</i> גָּלַא, גָּלִי	
<i>f.</i>	גָּלִיָּא	





## REMARKS.

1. *Praeter*. The third pl. masc. in *Praet. Peal* terminates sometimes after the Hebrew mode in וי; e. g. קָרַי Lam. 2: 3, גָּלוּ Num. 26: 64, בָּכוּ Gen. 33: 4. Jon. In *Ilhpeal*, this person occurs with a doubled וי, אֶחָבְרִי Gen. 2: 4. 3: 7. Jon. The third fem. pl. *Praet.* makes in the later Targums קָרְאָן, as קָרְאָן Ruth 4: 17, or contracted קָרְן Gen. 4: 8. T. H., אֶשְׁקִיאָן Gen. 19: 32, 35. Jon. For second sing. *Praet.* in *Peal* רְבִית is once written Dan. 4: 19. From the first pl. גְּלִינָא the form גְּלִינָא, a compound of the Partic. act. with אֲנָא (§ 13. 1) must be distinguished. There are but few instances of *Peal* with א prosthetic; e. g. אֶבְרִי Prov. 20: 12, אֶשְׁתִּירי Dan. 5: 4 (אֶשְׁתִּיראוי Joel 3: 3).

2. *Future*. Instead of ון the ending of the third Plur. is sometimes made regularly in ון; e. g. רְבִיוֹן Dan. 5: 2, רְשָׁנוֹן Dan. 4: 13, רְחִסָּנוֹן (from אָסִיר) Ezek. 47: 11, or the ו is apocopated, as רְמִטְוֹ Isa. 53: 8. Dan. 5: 10.

3. *Imperative*. The second pers. fem. sing. in *Peal* ends sometimes in וְ Isa. 47: 2. Gen. 4: 8. T. H.; that of the pl. is formed as קָרְן Exod. 2: 20, אֶשְׁתִּיר is at the same time prosthetic and apocopated Gen. 24: 14; see below.

4. *Infinitive*. The *Inf. Peal* has almost exclusively the form מְגִלָּא, where, united with a preposition, it serves as a Gerund, Prov. 25: 27. Esth. 5: 14. Ezra 5: 9. As *Inf. abs.* the form מְגִלָּא is in use Isa. 61: 10. Amos 5: 5. Gen. 26: 28. — The *Infinitives* of the other conjugations end in the later Targums sometimes (after the Talm. formation) in וי; e. g. אֶשְׁתִּירֵנוֹי Num. 12: 8. Jon., רְצִוִי Ps. 89: 16. The *Inf. absol.* in *Aphel* makes אֶסְנָא Gen. 3: 16. Jon.

5. *Participle*. In the form גְּלִי, *Peil* has a composite Sheva under the first consonant, even when it is not a guttural, Dan. 2: 19, 30 גְּלִי, גְּלִי, Ezra 4: 18 קָרִי. The passive *Participles* in *Peal* and *Aphel* end sometimes in אֶ; as, מְמַכָּא Gen. 43: 19. On the declension of *Participles* from verbs לֹא, see § 34 on Paradigm VII.

REM. 1. Apocopated *Futures* and *Imperatives* are less frequent in Chaldee than in Hebrew, and this mode of formation has far less effect here upon the general form of the word; comp. e. g. *Fut. apoc.* תִּשְׁתֵּי Hab. 2: 16, תִּהִי Eccl. 11: 3 as in Hebr. (רִשְׁתַּחֲוִי) תִּהִי Gen. 41: 40. Jon. 1 Sam. 14: 40. Exod. 22: 31 from תִּהְיֶה (otherwise תִּהְיֶה) Gen. 1: 29. 17: 4. 24: 14, 18. Jon.; תִּהְיֶה, תִּהְיֶה, תִּהְיֶה or תִּהְיֶה from חִיָּה Deut. 4: 1. Prov. 15: 27. Gen. 20: 7. 2 Kings 1: 2. 8: 10 (the signification is mostly *optative*); *Imp. apoc.* אֶשְׁתִּיר (with א prosthet.) Gen.

24: 14, שׁוּ (Paël) Gen. 44: 1, הוּ Gen. 37: 16, אָהֵל (Aphel). — מִיָּחִי is an apocopated *Partic. Aphel* instead of מִיָּחִי Deut. 32: 39.

REM. 2. In the biblical Chaldee, certain peculiar forms occur in the personal inflection of הוּא, in connection with לְ prefixed, after the analogy of the Fut. : לְהוּא (לְהוּיָה) Dan. 2: 20, 28, 41. 3: 18. Ezra 7: 23 etc., לְהוּן Dan. 2: 43. 6: 2 sq. 27. Ezra 6: 10. 7: 25 and לְהוּנָן Dan. 5: 17. That they are to be regarded as *Future* admits of no doubt, whether we consider their form, or the context in which they are found (for in all instances only a pure Fut. or an optative or Imper. is required); their grammatical explanation is difficult. Formerly, לְ was considered as a conjunction (*that*), and the preformative of the Fut. was supposed to have been lost in this particular combination (Gesen. Thesaur. I. p. 370); but against this, lies the fact that this לְ does not occur elsewhere in Chaldee, and also that the sense which arises in this way is not in every place appropriate. Hence Beer (*Inscriptiones et papyri vett. Semitici in Aegypto reperti* P. I. p. 18 sq.), who believed that he had found the form לְהוּי also upon the Carpentr. inscription, would take the לְ as a more unusual preform. *Fut.* (which has become frequent in the Talm.) instead of וּ; for only the third Pers. sing. masc. or the plur. masc. and fem. is denoted by those forms, while the regular הוּא occurs in immediate connection for the third sing. fem. This explanation suits also at all events Exod. 10: 28 T. H. הוּא לְמַמְזָר וְלֹא לְהוּי, where indeed the Inf. would be more strictly antithetic, and Exod. 22: 24 לְהוּי עֲלֹי סִדְרִין Jon., where the singular of the verb (according to § 49. 1) can occasion no surprise. Comp., besides, Dietrich de sermonis Chald. proprietate, p. 51 sq.

## § 24.

### *Verbs doubly anomalous.*

By this class of verbs are meant those in which two of the letters that are accustomed to occasion irregularities, occur together. In the inflection of such verbs, the peculiarities of both letters may be exhibited, or only those of one of them. They are the following :

1. Verbs פֶּן and לֹא (לֹה) ; e. g. נָפָא, נָסָא, נָפָא, נָפָא, נָפָה. These leave the first radical, where it closes a syllable, unassimilated; e. g. *Fut. Peal* יִנְצוּן Exod. 21: 22, חֲנָשִׁי Deut. 9: 7, אֲנָסִי (אֲנָסִיָּהוּ) Ps. 78: 56), מִהֲנָסִי Gen. 22: 1 T. H., אֲנָשִׁי Lam. 2: 6.



2. Verbs פא and לא; e. g. אָפּא, אָזא, אָסא, אָפּא, אָרָא. *Praet.*  
 3. f. אָרָה, 2. m. אָרָהָא, *Fut.* יִרְבִּי Deut. 29: 20, יִרְבִּי Gen. 33:  
 14. Gen. 49: 10, *Imp.* אָרָא 2 Sam. 14: 32, אָפּוֹ Exod. 16: 23, pl.  
 אָרוֹ Dan. 3: 26, per aphaeres. תִּרְיִי Prov. 9: 5 (Lond. אָרוֹ), *Infin.*  
 אָרִי, אָרָה *Particip. act.* אָרָה Dan. 3: 2, *Particip. act.* אָרָה  
 Dan. 7: 13. Gen. 33: 1, pass. אָזָא (אָזָא) Dan. 3: 22. — *Paël* אָפּי,  
*Part.* מִסְּ 2 Kings 20: 5. Deut. 32: 39 (מִצְפִּי Job 13: 4). — *Ithpeal*  
 אָפּוֹסִי Lev. 13: 18, *Part.* מִתְפַּסֵּי Lev. 2: 4, *Fut.* תִּתְפַּחֲרִי Lev. 13: 2.  
 — *Ithpaal* אָפּוֹסִי 2 Kings 5: 13. Isa. 51: 8. — *Aphel* אָרָהִי Gen. 4:  
 4 (תִּרְבִּי Dan. 6: 17), אָרָהִי Jer. 6: 7, אָרָהִי 1 Chron. 22: 4,  
*Fut.* אָרָהִי, *Imp.* אָרָהִי Num. 23: 5 or תִּרְבִּי Dan. 5: 2, *Infin.*  
 אָרָהִי Ps. 105: 31, *Part.* מִרְבִּי Gen. 6: 17. [The passive form of *Aphel*  
 Dan. 3: 13, תִּרְבִּי 6: 18, is altogether peculiar]. — *Ittaph.*  
 אָרָהִי Gen. 33: 11, on the contrary, תִּרְבִּי Ps. 45: 11.

3. Verbs פִּי and לא; e. g. יָדָא (יָדָה), יָדָא. *Future Peal* יָדָא  
 Ps. 50: 16, *Aphel Praet.* אוֹדִי Ps. 75: 2, אוֹדִי Exod. 13: 19, אוֹדִי  
 Gen. 19: 22, *plur.* אוֹדִי Ps. 30: 5, אוֹדִי Ps. 33: 2, 1. pers. אוֹדִי  
 Ps. 75: 2, *Fut.* יוֹדִי Isa. 5: 19, *Infin.* אוֹדָה Exod. 12: 33, *Part.*  
 מוֹדִי Prov. 28: 13, *Imp.* אוֹדִי Judg. 5: 2 [*Paël* from יוֹדָה with ו as  
 first radical יוֹדִי Lev. 16: 21, יוֹדִי 26: 40].

REM. Verbs with middle ו, which have א as their third stem-letter, do not belong here, since ו is pronounced as a consonant; e. g. הוֹא, הוֹא.

## § 25.

### *Defective Verbs and Mixed Forms.*

1. There are only a few verbs, of which all or even most of the *modes* and *tenses* are in actual use. So far as this has its origin in the limited extent of the written remains of the Chaldee language, it is not surprising, and does not belong to the province of grammatical inquiry. But in some verbs of frequent occurrence, it will be found that certain forms are constantly avoided, and that certain others, derived from synonymous verbs, have been universally retained in their place. This species of deficiency is different from the other, and must be noticed by the grammarian.

The following may serve as examples of such *defective verbs*;

- 1) יָהֵב and נָהֵן *to give*. The former is used in the *Praet.* and *Imper.* *Peal* as well as in *Ithpeal*; the latter, chiefly in the *Fut.* and *Inf. Peal*. — 2) סָלַק and נָסַק *to ascend*. The latter is used in the *Inf.* and *Imper. Peal* and in *Aphel*, Deut. 9: 9. 10: 1. 2 Kings 17: 4 (also in *Ithpaal* Lev. 6: 22); the former in the *Praet. Peal*, in the *Paël* and the *Passives* of the first and second conjugations. — 3) שָׁתָא and שָׁתָא *to drink*. The former occurs in *Peal*, the latter in *Aphel*. — 4) הָלַךְ and הָיָה *to go*. The latter is found in the *Inf.* and *Fut. Peal*, the former particularly in *Paël*.

An example of a double inflection united in the same word occurs in יָרַע. The *Fut.* makes commonly יָרַע § 20. 4, only the first person יָרַע (Ps. 39: 5. 101: 4) — yet also יָרַע Dan. 2: 9. Comp. besides, § 20. 3. Rem. and § 21. Rem.

- 2) The examples which have been usually adduced as *mixed forms*, do not deserve this appellation; for אֶתְקַרְבִּית Dan. 7: 15 and אֶתְרוּם Dan. 4: 16 are in fact the Syriac punctuation of the *Praet. Ithpeal* and the *Ithpoal*; and the first pers. *Fut.* אֶתְפָּרַע Judg. 15: 7 (ed. Ven.) instead of אֶתְפָּרַע is not destitute of all analogy, comp. Hebr. אֶתְפָּרַשׁ Gesen. Lehrgeb. p. 312. — יָרַע in Hos. 4: 2, is hardly to be considered as a compound of the *Part.* and *Fut.*; since the *Fut. Peal* of this verb has the form יָרַע, the third *fem. plur.* might be יָרַע after the analogy of הָצִיָּן Jer. 3: 19.

## § 26.

### *Irregular Verbs with Suffixes.*

1. The forms of most *irregular verbs* before suffixes are the same essentially as those of the regular verb, and so far as respects the verbs פָּן, עָב, עָו, פִּי, will be readily inferred from § 16. The following examples may suffice for the purpose of illustration:
- a) פָּן; פָּן Judg. 20: 32, רָשָׁלִיךָ Ps. 91: 12, רָשָׁלִיךָ Ps. 28: 3, סָבַח 1 Sam. 20: 21. Jer. 36: 14, אֶתְפָּקֵן Exod. 32: 12, אֶתְפָּקֵן Job 10: 18, אֶתְפָּקֵן Num. 20: 5, אֶתְפָּקֵן Exod. 16: 32, b) עָב; חָשַׁלְנִי Jer. 20: 5, אֶתְפָּקֵן Dan. 7: 23, אֶתְפָּקֵן Ps. 44: 20, אֶתְפָּקֵן Dan. 2: 24, אֶתְפָּקֵן Judg. 19: 3, c) עָו; שָׁמַח Gen. 50: 26, שָׁמַח

Ezra 5: 14, חֲדָשָׁה Dan. 7: 23, *Pa.* קִימָהּ Ps. 105: 10, קִימָתִי Ps. 30: 4, אֶקְיִמֶנּוּ Jer. 33: 7, *Aph.* אֶקְיִמָהּ Dan. 3: 2, קִימָנָה Hos. 6: 2, *Imp.* אֶקְיִמֵנִי Ps. 41: 12, אֶתְבָּנָה Jer. 31: 18, חֲתִיבוּנָה Ezra 5: 11, *d)* אֶחֱדָשָׁה Ezek. 28: 19, יִדְעָהּ Deut. 22: 2, *Aph.* אֶחֱדָשָׁה Dan. 5: 7, הוֹרְעָתִי Dan. 2: 13, לְהוֹרְעָתִי Dan. 2: 26. Similar are the inflections of פִּא אֹיֶכְלֶיךָ Ezek. 16: 19, יוֹכֵלֶנָּה Num. 11: 4, הוֹבְרָנִי Prov. 1: 32, אֹיֶכְלָה *Imp.* Prov. 25: 21.

2. Less conformed to the regular type are the forms of verbs לא before *suffixes*. The following cases may be noted:

a) א *quiescent*, at the end of the *Praet. Peal*, is but seldom retained with its vowel; e. g. בָּרָאִנִי Prov. 8: 22, הוֹצָאָה Gen. 38: 15; the *suffix* usually so connects itself with this verbal form, that א is expelled: הוֹצִיאָהּ Judg. 19: 3, בָּנָהּ Ezra 5: 11, קָרָהּ Jer. 36: 21, חָלָנִי Isa. 42: 5.

b) י *quiescent*, at the end of the *Praet.* and *Fut.*, is apt to be rejected with its vowel, while the *suffixes* assumed, particularly in the *Fut.*, are those with נ epenthetic; e. g. יִחוּצָהּ Lev. 13: 21, יִחוּצָנִי Exod. 33: 20, אֶמְנָנִי Ps. 139: 8, *Paël* אֶשְׁנֶנָּה 1 Kings 11: 34, אִירָמֶנִי Dan. 5: 7, מְנָנִי Josh. 9: 27, *Aphel* אֶשְׁרִיהָ Gen. 2: 15, אִירָמֶנִי 2 Sam. 8: 7, אֶרְתָּהּ Judg. 18: 4, אִירְתֶּיהָ 1 Sam. 5: 1, אֶצְדָּנִי 5: 6, אֶחוּצָהּ Judg. 13: 23; י seldom occurs as movable; e. g. רָבָהּ Esth. 10: 2, שָׁרָהּ Exod. 2: 14, אֶנְשִׁינִי Gen. 41: 51, אֶחוּרָהּ Deut. 4: 36, Ezek. 11: 25, Gen. 34: 2, Obad. 7.

c) י *quiescent* is retained in the Imperatives of all the conjugations; e. g. רָמִיחֵהּ Exod. 4: 3, אֶחוּצֵהּ Judg. 1: 24, אֶחוּצֵהּ Exod. 33: 18 (on the contrary קָרָהּ Jer. 36: 15).

d) The י of the third *plur. Praet. Peal* and of the *Imper.* is changed into ו, but the ending ו־י into ו־ו; e. g. רָמִינִי Jon. 1: 12, חֲזוּהָ Lam. 1: 7, עֲטָרִינָהּ Isa. 3: 12, אֶבְעִירֶיהָ Isa. 1: 8 (on the contrary רָמוּחֵהּ Jer. 38: 9, מְחוּנִי Josh. 9: 18, רָמוּנִי Josh. 10: 27).

e) The persons of the *Praeters* in ו־יָה and ו־יָהּ remain unchanged; e. g. רָמִיתִּי Jon. 2: 4, חֲזִיתִיהָ Gen. 44: 28, רָבִיתָהּ Isa. 42: 6, אֶחְמֶתִי Ps. 71: 20.

On the *Infin. Peal* and the *Participles*, see below § 34. The Infinitives of the several conjug. with the exception of *Peal* (comp. § 16. 2. c.) have the termination ו־הָ; e. g. מְלִיחָהּ Jer. 33: 5, קְשִׁיחָהּ Gen. 35: 17.



## CHAPTER IV.

## The Noun.

## § 27.

*The Derivation of Nouns.*

1. The Chaldee nouns are, like the Hebrew, partly *primitive*, partly *derivative*. Among the *primitive*, we are to reckon those nouns of one or two syllables which express simple ideas, i. e. nouns which are the names of such objects and conceptions as it must have been most necessary to mark in the first stage of the development of language, and which according to principles now admitted in Hebrew (Gesenius, *Lehrgeb.* p. 478 sq.) are considered there also as underived; e. g. אָב, בָּר, אָם, אָח, יוֹם, יָד, חוּר, חוּר, חוּר, חוּר, חוּר (the simple Numerals generally). The *derivatives*, which constitute the great majority here, as in Hebrew, come chiefly from verbs, but some also from other nouns; and hence they are subdivided into *verbals* and *denominatives*.

To deny the existence of *primitive nouns* in the Semitic languages is unpsychological; and it must be viewed as a species of pedantry only to derive, e. g. יָד from יָדָה, בֶּן from בָּנָה, or to insist on lost roots for יָדָה, אָרֶע (אָרֶץ). Still the eastern languages, it is to be remembered, were formed under the influence of that stronger view, that more vivid conception of nature and its phenomena, which was peculiar to the oriental; and it is undeniable that *many* nouns were derived from verbal ideas, which *we* might consider as primitive, and that the whole number of primitive nouns to be found here is in fact very small. Hence on the question of more or less, there will always be room for dispute.

2. The derivation of nouns<sup>1</sup> is effected, either, a) as in the inflection of verbs, merely by a varied punctuation of the stem (of two consonants or three); e. g. מֶלֶךְ *king*, from מָלַךְ, אֶסֶר *command*, from אָסַר, זָעִיר *small*, from זָעַר, חֵילָא *part*, from חָלַק, זוּהַר

<sup>1</sup> A catalogue of the verbal nouns, arranged in classes, is given by Opitz, *Chaldaism.* p. 152sq.

*splendor*, from זָהַר (sometimes even this is omitted, and the noun coincides entirely with its stem-word; e. g. סִפָּר from (סִפַּר); or, b) by a reduplication of one (commonly the second), or of two of the stem-consonants (particularly in order to express intensity or augmentation); e. g. גִּבֹּר *powerful*, from גִּבַּר, גִּנֵּב *thief*, from גָּנַב, חָכִים *wise*, from חָכַם, מִגְרָוּל *migration*, from מָוַל; or, c) by the use of formative letters, which are prefixed or annexed to the original word (sometimes both); e. g. אֲבָדָן *destruction*, from אָבַד, מַחְסוֹר *want*, from חָסַר, מַכְתָּשׁ *blow*, from כָּתַשׁ, מִדְּנָה *east*, from דָּנָה, תִּלְמִיד *pupil*, from לָמַד, תּוֹרָב *inhabitant*, from יָרַב, שִׁעְבוּד *servitude*, from עָבַד. The formative letters assumed at the beginning are most frequently א, מ, ת, seldom ה, י, ש; those assumed at the end are chiefly ך and ם, in the case of feminine nouns א and ת, as דְּהָלָא *fear*, מִשְׁרִירָא *encampment*.

3. In the course of the inflection itself of the verb, two forms arise, the *Inf.* and *Particip.*, in which the verbal idea takes the character of a noun; and, it will be found, that most substantives derived from verbs manifestly depend on one of these formations as their general model and basis. Thus abstract nouns are derived most directly from the *Infinitive*, and with various modifications represent also its form; while concrete nouns correspond with a like diversity of signification and appearance to the *Participles*. In order to justify indeed this classification of nouns under *Infin.* and *Particip.*, respect must be had to other Semitic dialects, particularly the Arabic; and it is not to be forgotten also, that some formations may occur in both classes; e. g. קָטַל. We shall, therefore, in the sequel present all the principal forms of Chaldee nouns, in conformity with the three-fold division noticed above under No. 2, and so advance from the simple and earliest formations to the later and more artificial.

§ 28.

*Nouns derived from the Regular Verb.*

a) Derivatives with the stem-consonant unchanged.

1. קָטֵל (קָטַל), קָטֵל, קָטֵל, קָטֵל (corresponding to the Hebr. Segholate forms), which denote usually abstract ideas; e. g. סֵפֶר *book*, טַעַם *taste*, צָרָה *need*, תְּקוּהָה *strength*; less frequently concrete; e. g. מֶלֶךְ *king*, אָדָם *man*. — 2. קָטֵל (with long, unchangeable *a* between the last two stem-consonants); e. g. כָּתָב *writing*, מָלָח *war*, שָׁלָם *peace*. — 3. קָטֵל (dissyllabic) the form of the first *Particip. Peal*, employed in a concrete sense, especially for the designation of pursuits or employments, כֹּהֵן *priest*, קָטֵף *vine-dresser*, חֲמֹל *husbandman*, then of inherent qualities: יָבֵשׁ *dry*, סָבֵל *foolish*. — 4. קָטֵל (second *Part. Peal*), קָטֵל, קָטֵל, קָטֵל (with long *i*, *o* or *u* between the last two radicals), likewise in a concrete sense (especially as adjectives); e. g. דָּחִיל *fearful*, מְרִיר *bitter*, מְשִׁיחַ *anointed*, זָעִיר *small*, חֲזָק *strong*, אֲבוֹל *gate*, יָנוּק *suckling*; as expressive of abstract ideas, e. g. שְׂחִיל *planting*, רָחִיחַ *terror*, שְׁבוּק *remission*, לְבוּשׁ *raiment*, אֲסוּר *band*. The dissyllabic form קָטֵל (Hebr.) is uncommon; e. g. קָרִיב *near*. — 5. קוֹטֵל, קוֹטֵל, קוֹטֵל (a long, unchangeable vowel after the first stem-consonant); the first, principally adjectives for the expression of inherent qualities, especially of colors; e. g. אֲדָמָה *black*, סוּדָה *red*; the second or concrete terms, as צוּלָם *young man*; the third (seldom) as abstract, but which are properly concrete, e. g. חוֹתֵם *seal*, (pp. he or that which seals), אֲבוֹר *destruction*.

b) Intensive forms with a reduplication of one or more of the stem-consonants.

6. קָטֵל, in part concrete, which express a permanent, accustomed action or performance, e. g. גָּנַב *thief*, טָבַח *cook*, פָּרַשׁ *horseman*, from a quadril. שֹׁפֵרֵס *shepherd*. — in part, but less frequently abstract, as חֲבָל *destruction*, יַעֲבֹא *outcry*. — 7. קָטֵל, e. g. גָּבֵר *strong*, לָשׁוֹן *tongue*, בָּתָן *flax*. — 8. קָטֵל, mostly adjectives which denote physical properties, especially defects; e. g. אֵלֵם *dumb*, חֵרֵשׁ *deaf*. — 9. קָטֵל, abstract (considerably frequent), פְּקוּדָה *prescription*, סְגוּרָה



*oppression*, צָפוֹן *north*. — 10. קָטֵל and קָטִיל, which are employed mostly as adjectives, e. g. קָדוֹשׁ *holy*, בְּרִיּוֹת *first fruits*, תְּקוּפָה *powerful*, יָפִיר *fair*. Both forms are strengthened from קָטִיל and קָטֵל, and in some words they are found together; e. g. סָלִיחַ and סָלִיחָה, סוּמָק and סוּמָכָה. — 11. Reduplicated forms like סָגֵלְגֵל *round*, שָׁפַרְפַּר *dawn*, עֲלֵעוֹל *tempest*, הִרְהוֹר *thought*, a somewhat extensive class (yet more numerous and varied still in the Rabbinic).

c) With consonants added.

12. מִקְטֵל (מִקְטֵל), e. g. מִגְדֵּל *tower*, מִדְרָשׁ *examination*, מִעֲבֹד *action*, מִחְשָׁבָה *thought*, מִסְפָּד *mourning*; especially of the place where the act which the verb expresses is performed; e. g. מִדְּבַח *altar* (from דָּבַח *to sacrifice*), מִדְּבָר *pasture* (from דָּבַר *to drive*), מִדִּנָּה *east* (from דִּנָּה *to go up*), or the instrument, e. g. מִזְרָק *bowl* (from זָרַק *to sprinkle*), מִתְּקָל *weight* (from תָּקַל *to weigh*). — 13. מִקְטוֹל, e. g. מִבְּעוֹר *conflagration*. — 14. מוֹקְטֵל, e. g. מוֹקְדָשׁ *sanctuary*, all three Infinitive formations. — 15. מִקְטֵל and מִקְטִיל (*Partic. Pacl* and *Aphel*) as concrete; e. g. מַשְׁמִיט *servant*, with the adjective ending: מַשְׁמִיטִין, מַשְׁמִיטִיָּה, מַשְׁמִיטִיָּה, — and מִקְטֵל (*Pual*); e. g. מְנוּחָה *preparation*. — 16. With prefixed א (ה) אִקְטֵלָה, e. g. אִחְסָנָה *possession*, הִטְמִינָה *concealment* (from *Aphel*). — 17. נִקְטוֹל, e. g. נִחְשׁוֹל *storm*. — 18. שִׁקְטוֹל and שִׁקְטוֹל (*Schaphel*), e. g. שִׁעְבּוֹד *servitude*, שִׁבְחָה *glory*. — 19. תִּקְטִיל, e. g. תִּשְׁלִימָה *recompense*, תִּפְקִידָה *arrangement*, and הוֹקְטֵל, e. g. הוֹשְׁלִמָה *recompense*, הוֹסַקָּה *occasion*, הוֹשְׁבָּה *praise*. — 20. The forms in תִּן, which are derived from the stem without the intervention of another noun (§ 30), viz. קָטֵל and קוֹטֵל, e. g. נִצָּחַן *victory*, כוֹלָחַן *service*, חוֹשֶׁבֶן *reckoning, account*. They rest indeed upon the form נִצָּח (נִצָּחָה) and פוֹלָח (פּוֹלָחָה) as their type, but in many cases have been derived directly from the verbal stem. — 21. Derivatives of the passives, as הִחְבֵּלָה *haste*, אִתְּרַגְּלוּ, etc.

## § 29.

*Nouns derived from the irregular Verb.*

1. From verbs פָּן : 12. מָסַר *saw*, מָצַב *planting*, מִנְהַג *custom*, מִטְרָא *prison*, מִקָּר *acquaintance*. 13. מִטְּוִל *burden*. 15. מִזִּיק *demon* (properly the injurious). 16. מִלְחָמָה *war*, מִלְּהוּת *illumination*. 20. With the annexed syllable הַן : מִפְּקָן *departure*.

2. From verbs עָצ : a) Monosyllabic forms : רָק *thin*, חֵן *favor*, חֵם *heat*, fem. מִלָּא *word*; b) Polysyllabic : 4. חָבִיב *loved*, 10. רָקִיק *thin*, 12. מִזְלָן *entrance*, and with reduplication (No. 11) גִּלְגֵּל *wheel*, גִּלְגּוּל *revolution*, גִּלְגָּל *skull*.

3. From verbs פָּא : מִיכָל *food*, מִימָר *word*, which forms resolve themselves into No. 12, and are properly Infinitive.

4. From verbs פִּי : דַּעַת *knowing* (Infin.). 4. יָדִיעָא *knowledge*. 10. בְּקִיר *costly*, יָתִיר *excellent*; with prefixed formative letters : מִילָד *birth*, מִישֵׁר *plain* (Infin. *Peal*), מוֹחָב *abode*, מוֹחֵב *present*, חוֹבְחָא *correction*, חוֹחֵב *inhabitant*, מוֹדַע *acquaintance* (from *Aphel*), אֶקְפִּיחָא *association*.

5. From verbs עִי (עִי) : a) Monosyllabic forms as concrete and abstract (from *Part.* and *Infin.*), עָק *narrow*, קָמָא *pillar*, בּוֹמָא *sleeping*, חוֹב *debt*, חוֹבָא *debt*, רִיץ *joy*, then חֵיב *return*, סָרָה *end*; b) Dissyllabic, דָּרַשׁ *treading to pieces, trituration*; with a doubling of the second stem-letter; 6. דִּין *judge*, רִיר *inhabitant*, also abstr. עֵק *affliction*. 9. עִיוָק *distress*, צִיּוּר *image*, concr. גִּיּוּר *stranger*; — c) with prefixed formative letters : 2. מִמָּת *punishment of death*, מָקָם *position* (Infin. *Peal*). 4. מִבוֹשׁ *oppression*, מְגוּפָה *covering*, מִזוֹן *food*, from *Aphel* מְמִיכָן *mock*, מְמִיכָן *mock*, מְנַפָּא *movement, motion*.

6. From verbs לָא : a) רָבִיא *pure*, רִבִּי *physician*, חֶלִי *sweet* (participial forms of *Peal*, for the expression of concrete ideas, comp. 3. and 4.), רְכוּחָא *purity*, גְּלוּת *captivity*, גְּלוּת *eminentence*, purely abstract; b) חֵדְוָא *joy*, חוֹלְקָא *sweetness*, מִנְיָן *number* (מִנְיָא), מִנְיָן *idol*, with the third stem-consonant movable; — c) with a reduplication : זָבִי *guiltless*, עָלִי (same as עֲלִיוֹן), זָנָא *whoremonger*, comp. No. 6.; — d) with prefixed letters, e. g. מִנְיָן *number*, מְדִירָא *winnowing-shovel*, מְרִירו *reproof*.

## § 30.

*Denominative Nouns.*

Here belong *a)* some *nuda*, especially of the form קָטַל, e. g. סָפֵן *seaman* (comp. סְפִינָא *ship*), קֶשֶׁת *archer*, from קֶשֶׁתָא *bow*; *b)* the most *aucta* in יָ- (יִ-), *fem.* יָאָה (יִיאָה), and in יָ-, chiefly adjectives (the former, ordinal numerals, or *patronymics* and *gentiles*), e. g. סָרְבֵן *rebel*, (from סָרַב), אֲבָדֵן *destruction*, (from אָבַד), בּוֹסֵרֵן *despised*, מִבְּסֵרֵן *despiser*, from מִבְּסַר, מְזוֹבְנֵן *seller*, סוֹבְלָתֵן *discerning*, נָכְרִי *stranger*, מִצְרִי *Egyptian*, צוּרִי *Tyrian*, חִלּוּנִי *foreigner*, מִזְנֵחִי *oriental*; *c)* many *feminines* in וִת and יִית, e. g. טְבוּתָא *goodness*, from טָב, מְלָכוּתָא *kingdom*, from מָלַךְ, אֱלִימּוּתָא *valor*, from אֱלִים, אֲלִמּוּתָא *dumbness*, from אָלַם, אֶלְמָנוּתָא *widowhood*, from אָלַמן *widower*, עֶלְמּוּתָא *youth*, from עוֹלָם, בְּכִירוּתָא *first-birth, seniority*, from בָּכִיר, סוֹבְלָתְנוּתָא *discernment*, from סוֹבְלָתֵן, שְׂרָשִׁירָא *extirpation*, from שָׂרַשׁ.

REM. Greek and Latin nouns which passed over into the Chaldee in great numbers (see p. 19), were either retained with their ending where the form allowed it, and inflected according to the Chaldee analogy, e. g. זִוְנָא ζώνη, בָּסִיס βάσις, פִּרְלָגוּס πέλγος, קִיטוֹן κοιτών, δῶρον δῶρον, אִיקוֹן εἰκών, plur. אִיקוֹנִין Gen. 4: 6. Jon., or they received a Chaldee termination instead of their foreign one; e. g. גְּלוּסְקָמָא γλωσσόκομον Gen. 50: 26. Jon., אִוקְטָרִיִּיא octariones Exod. 14: 51, סוּדָרָא sudarium Exod. 34: 33. The other changes which such words underwent in pronunciation were but few, and confined almost exclusively to those points in which adaptation to the organs of the oriental required them; e. g. קִסְטָא ξέστης, אִסְפִּלִּידָא σπηλάδιον, אִתְרִטְרוֹן ἀτρίτρον (§ 6. e.), סְפּוֹקְלָטוֹר speculator, אִפִּטְרוֹפּוֹס ἐπίτροπος.

## § 31.

*Gender and Number of Nouns.*

1. Nouns have two genders, *Masc.* and *Fem.* (the absence of the Neuter being common to all the Semitic languages); but the feminines were not in all cases either originally or constantly distinguished by their form from the masculines. In addition to the concrete (animate) objects, which are feminine by nature, those also are treated as such according to the vivid, oriental mode of



conception, with which we associate the ideas of mildness, delicacy, weakness, dependence, care, nourishment, support. In this respect, the Chaldee agrees perfectly with the Hebrew. See Ewald, *Krit. Grammatik*, p. 299 sq. The necessity, however, of forms or terminations for distinguishing the feminine gender, was early felt, and the final syllables אֶתְ (הֶתְ), וִי, וִי, וִי (וִי, וִי, וִי), were created for this purpose. Yet with reference to the first of these, great caution is necessary; since the masculines also in a certain formation (*status emphaticus*, see § 32) terminate in אֶתְ. Our only safe rule, therefore, will be to consider those nouns merely as feminine, which are likewise such in other Semitic dialects, or which are clearly shown to be of this gender by the grammatical connection.

The ending הֶתְ is chiefly a Hebraizing form, and occurs for the most part in adjectives and participles (in Dan. and Ezra); in the Chaldee itself, it appears regularly only in feminines which come from masculines in וִי; e. g. קְדָמָא from קְדָמִי. Besides, הֶתְ is found in a few substantives, whose second radical is א; e. g. סְאָה, מְאָה, פְּאָה, or which are founded on an Infin. from לָא; e. g. אֹרְאָה, אֹרְאָה; but in מְלָה, מְחִיבָה, מְחִיבָה, it co-exists with אֶתְ.

The full ending וִי occurs only in the absolute state of feminine adjectives (especially patronymics), which are derived from masculines in וִי; e. g. תְּלָחִית, אֲרָמִית, יְהוּדָאִית.

According to the above, the number of words in the Chaldee, which are feminine without a feminine ending, is not less than in Hebrew (and Syriac); and it may be added that to a very great extent they are the same; e. g. אֶבֶן *stone*, אֶרֶץ *path*, אֶרֶץ *earth*, אוֹרֵן *ear*, חֶרֶב *sword*. These must be learned individually from the lexicon; though the student can hardly fail to remark in every instance an exemplification of the principle which has been mentioned, as leading to the usage in question. — Other nouns have the double gender (*gen. commune*), e. g. חֶסֶד *sign*, אֶשׁ *fire*, גִּפְתָּא *vine* (so the numerals from twenty to a hundred inclusive.)

2. There are also two numbers, *singular* and *plural*; for the few dual forms in use are borrowed from the Hebrew, and are found only in the biblical Chaldee (Dan. 2: 34. 7: 4, 7); on the contrary, in the Targums, objects which exist in pairs are expressed by the plural (§ 55. 3), while that which is two-fold, or

the idea of duality, is denoted by the numeral תַּרְיִן. The plural of masculines is characterized by the termination יָ; that of feminines, by the termination תָּ; since the ending תָּ, analogous to the Hebrew וְ, is employed in Chaldee only for the *stat. constr.* (§ 32. 2.)

In the case of most *masculines* which end with a radical, the above termination is merely appended to the form of the singular; e. g. שׂוֹר *rock*, Pl. שׂוֹרִין, לִשְׁנִין, לִשְׁנִין; only those in יָ or אֵ have אֵי; while those in אֵ or יָ (derivatives from לֵא) form their plural in יָ. *Feminines* in אֵ change this termination into תָּ; those in וּ, יָ, and וּ pronounce these consonants in the plural, and terminate, therefore, in וּ and וּ; e. g. מְלָכִית Pl. מְלָכִית, מְשָׁרִית Pl. מְשָׁרִית, רַבּוֹת Pl. רַבּוֹת; finally, those in אֵ (from masculines in יָ) receive the ending תָּ; e. g. קְדָמָא Pl. קְדָמָת. It is a singular usage of the later Targums, that the ending תָּ in feminines of the first kind, instead of being appended directly to the stem, is sometimes added to the *stat. constr.*, as בְּהוֹלֶתֶן *Esth.* 2: 2, עֲלִימָתֶן *2: 8. 4: 4.* In the place of this, the London text has בְּהוֹלֶתֶן and עֲלִימָתֶן.

In the Talmudic Chaldee, יָ of the masculine ending יָ regularly falls away, and a shortened plural in יָ is also in use, e. g. אֲסִירִי for אֲסִירִין *Gen.* 39: 20 and oftener in *Jon.*, e. g. *Gen.* 1: 21. 8: 22. 12: 6. Yet other nouns take this form in *stat. constr.*; see § 56. 1.

3. As in Hebrew, so here many masculine forms in the singular have a feminine ending in the plural, and the reverse; e. g. תִּשָּׂא Pl. תִּשָּׂת, תִּבָּא Pl. תִּבָּת, מִלִּין Pl. מִלָּת, אֲמִין Pl. אֲמָת, אֲרָבִין Pl. אֲרָבָת. *Comp. Fürst*, p. 214.

In some nouns, both plural terminations are employed, even in the same Targum, e. g. אֲמִין Pl. אֲמָת and אֲמָתֶן, נְהַרִין Pl. נְהַרִין and אֲזַמְלִין (as if from the Sing. נְהַרִית), אֲזַמְלִין Pl. אֲזַמְלִין and אֲזַמְלִין, גִּנִּין Pl. גִּנָּת and גִּנִּין *Isa.* 66: 17. 1: 29, אֲרָבִין Pl. אֲרָבָת and אֲרָבָתֶן, Jer. 32: 43. *Hos.* 10: 4, יוֹמִין Pl. יוֹמָת and יוֹמָתֶן *Gen.* 8: 10. *Ezra* 4: 15, בְּרָכָא *blessing* Pl. בְּרָכָת and בְּרָכָתֶן *Num.* 32: 20. *Deut.* 28: 8, etc. In this case, a difference of signification sometimes distinguishes the two numbers. Thus קָלִין Pl. from קָל signifies tropically *tonitrua* *Exod.* 9: 23, on the contrary קָלֶן *voces* *Ps.* 93: 4. *Epicene* nouns also must be distinguished from the above examples; e. g. סוֹסִין Pl. סוֹסִין and סוֹסִין *2 Kings* 5: 9. 2: 11.

Some nouns occur only in the plural; e. g. חַיִּין *life*, שְׁמַיָּא *heaven*, עוֹלָמִין *countenance*, particularly such as denote periods of life, as: עוֹלָמִין

youth, בְּהוּלִין *age of virginity*, נְעוּרִין *boyhood* (yet several of these words are also singular in וְיָרָא). — Others are found only in the singular, as results naturally from their signification; e. g. the names of the metals, as, דָּהָב *gold*, פָּרָזֶל *iron*, כֶּסֶף *silver* (Pl. כֶּסֶפִּין *argenta* Gen. 42: 25, said of coined silver).

## § 32.

### *Different Relations (Status) of Nouns.*

1. The number of the states (*status*) so called, in which a noun may be placed, is greater in Chaldee than in Hebrew. In addition to the *absolute* and *construct* state, we have here also the *status emphaticus*, or *emphatic* state, as it is termed, and which was designed originally to express the noun with the definite article. (Similar in Danish is *Konungen* from *Konung*.) Yet in practice this form has acquired extensively a weakened sense, and the *status emphaticus* has almost uniformly taken the place of the *status absolutus*.

The indefinite article *a, an*, was denoted, when perspicuity required it, by the numeral חַד placed after the substantive; e. g. Dan. 2: 31. 6: 18. Ezra 4: 8. 2 Chron. 18: 7.

2. The characteristic endings of the *status constr.* are the following: *a*) The plural termination of *masculines* יָ- is changed into יִ- (in the sing. of such nouns the *st. constr.* has no separate form distinct from that of the *absol.*). *b*) The singular termination of *feminines* in אֵ- (הֵ-) passes into תֵ-; in the plural, into תִ-. *Feminines* in הֵ and יֵ retain their original תֵ in the *st. constr.* sing.; e. g. מַלְכּוּתָא, in the Plur., agreeably to the above, תִּן and תֵּן become תִּת and תֵּת.

The relation of the genitive can be expressed in the Aramaean in various ways, as well as by the form of the *stat. constr.* One mode is that of prefixing תֵּ to the second word; e. g. מַלְכּוּתָא דְאַרְרָא *the king of the land*. See in respect to this, Syntax § 56.

3. The *status emphaticus* is characterized in both *genders* and *numbers* by the termination אֵ- (but in *masculines* in יֵ-, by הֵ-). In the singular, *a*) *masculines*, with the exception of such as terminate in אֵ- or יֵ-, merely assume this ending without change,



e. g. סֹסֶס from סוּס; but masculines in אֵ- and יֵ- exchange these syllables, the first for יֵ-, the second for אֵ-, e. g. גִּלְגָּל from גִּלְגָּל, קִדְמָא from קִדְמִי. *b*) Feminines in אֵ- receive as the ending of the *st. emphat.* הֵ-, e. g. מִלְכָּה from מִלְכָּה; but those in אֵ- take הֵ-, e. g. קִדְמִיָּה from קִדְמָא; finally, those in וֵ- and יֵ- appear with the full termination וֵה and יֵה, e. g. מִלְכוּתָהּ. — In the plural, *a*) the masculine ending יֵ- is changed into וֵה, e. g. מִלְכֵּה; but in nouns which have יֵ- in the Sing., it is changed into יֵה, e. g. קִדְמֵי from קִדְמֵי, in the Bible קִדְמֵי comp. Ezra 4: 9. 5: 1. 6: 7 etc. *b*) In feminines, the אֵ- of the *st. emphat.* is added to the *st. constr.*, e. g. מִדִּינָה, מִלְכוּתָהּ, גִּלְגָּלָהּ; those, however, which terminate in the Sing. in אֵ- resume their original יֵ-, e. g. קִדְמִיָּה from קִדְמָא.

4. Before *suffixes* (in *statu suffixo*) the final syllables of nouns undergo the following modifications: *a*) Masculine derivatives in יֵ- receive אֵ-, e. g. קִדְמָא from קִדְמִי; those in אֵ- (from verbs לָא) change these letters, in the Sing., into יֵ- movable, e. g. גִּלְגָּל from גִּלְגָּל; — *b*) All Plur. masculines reject the ending יֵ- (יֵה) and take in their place the suffixes of nouns plural; — *c*) Feminines in אֵ- change these letters in the Sing. into הֵ-, e. g. מִלְכָּה from מִלְכָּה; those in וֵ- and יֵ- appear in the form of the *st. constr.*, e. g. מִלְכוּתָהּ; those in אֵ- (*radic.*) end in יֵה, e. g. גִּלְגָּלָהּ, those in אֵ- (from *masc.* in יֵ-) resume their original Yodh, e. g. קִדְמִיָּה; — *d*) In the plural of feminine nouns, the suffixes are always attached to the form of the *st. constr.*, e. g. מִדִּינָהוֹן, מִדִּינָהוֹן, מִלְכוּתָהוֹן.

### § 33.

#### *Declension of Nouns.*

When nouns are inflected, i. e. when in accordance with what has been stated, they are changed into the different *states* (*status*) of the Sing. and Plur., or suffixes are attached to them, this takes place (the tone being moved forward more or less according to the nature of the form of the word) either without any further change, especially in the vowels required for pronunciation, or with some change in this respect. Hence nouns are naturally divided, with

reference to their inflection, into two great classes, which we may designate by the terms *changeable* and *unchangeable*. The first of these, since the vowel-changes depend on the peculiar forms of the noun and, accordingly, are very various, must be referred to several Paradigms, which occupy the place of declensions in the occidental languages. These Paradigms of masculine, as well as feminine nouns, are exhibited in the following Table.

## 1. DECLENSION OF

	I.		II.	
Singular.	a.	b.	a.	b.
	<i>rock</i>	<i>murder</i>	<i>law</i>	<i>hero</i>
<i>St. absol.</i>	טוֹר	קְטוֹל	דֵּת	גִּבֹּר
<i>St. constr.</i>	טוֹר	קְטוֹל	דֵּת	גִּבֹּר
<i>St. emphat.</i>	טוֹרָא	קְטוֹלָא	דֵּתָא	גִּבֹּרָא
<i>With suffix.</i>	{ טוֹרָה	{ קְטוֹלָה	{ דֵּתָה	{ גִּבֹּרָה
	טוֹרְכוֹן	קְטוֹלְכוֹן	דֵּתְכוֹן	גִּבֹּרְכוֹן
Plural.				
<i>St. absol.</i>	טוֹרִין	קְטוֹלִין	דֵּתִין	גִּבֹּרִין
<i>St. constr.</i>	טוֹרִי	קְטוֹלִי	דֵּתִי	גִּבֹּרִי
<i>St. emphat.</i>	טוֹרִיא	קְטוֹלִיא	דֵּתִיא	גִּבֹּרִיא
<i>With suffix.</i>	{ טוֹרוֹהִי	{ קְטוֹלוֹהִי	{ דֵּתוֹהִי	{ גִּבֹּרוֹהִי
	טוֹרִיכוֹן	קְטוֹלִיכוֹן	דֵּתִיכוֹן	גִּבֹּרִיכוֹן

## V.

## VI.

Singular.		a.	b.	c.
	<i>murderer</i>	<i>back</i>	<i>goat</i>	<i>people</i>
<i>St. absol.</i>	מִתְקַטֵּל	גַּב	עֵז	אָם
<i>St. constr.</i>	מִתְקַטֵּל	גַּב	עֵז	אָם
<i>St. emphat.</i>	מִתְקַטֵּלָא	גַּבָא	עֵזָא	אָמָא
<i>With suffix.</i>	מִתְקַטֵּלָה	גַּבָה	עֵזָה	אָמָה
Plural.				
<i>St. absol.</i>	מִתְקַטְלִין	גַּבִּין	עֵזִין	אָמִין
<i>St. constr.</i>	מִתְקַטְלִי	גַּבִּי	עֵזִי	אָמִי
<i>St. emphat.</i>	מִתְקַטְלִיא	גַּבִּיא	עֵזִיא	אָמִיא
<i>With suffix.</i>	מִתְקַטְלִיכוֹן	גַּבִּיכוֹן	עֵזִיכוֹן	אָמִיכוֹן



MASCULINE NOUNS.

III.

IV.

a.	b.	a.	b.	c.
<i>age</i>	<i>priest</i>	<i>king</i>	<i>time</i>	<i>eye</i>
עֶלֶם	כֹּהֵן	מֶלֶךְ	זֶמֶן	עֵין
עֶלֶם	כֹּהֵן	מֶלֶךְ	זֶמֶן	עֵין
עֶלְמָא	כֹּהֲנָא	מֶלְכָא	זֶמְנָא	עֵינָא
עֶלְמָה	כֹּהֲנִיה	מֶלְכִּיה	זֶמְנִיה	עֵינִיה
עֶלְמִכוֹן	כֹּהֲנִיכוֹן	מֶלְכִּיכוֹן	זֶמְנִיכוֹן	עֵינִיכוֹן
עֶלְמִין	כֹּהֲנִין	מֶלְכִין	זֶמְנִין	עֵינִין
עֶלְמִי	כֹּהֲנִי	מֶלְכִי	זֶמְנִי	עֵינִי
עֶלְמִיָּא	כֹּהֲנִיָּא	מֶלְכִיָּא	זֶמְנִיָּא	עֵינִיָּא
עֶלְמוֹהִי	כֹּהֲנוֹהִי	מֶלְכוֹהִי	זֶמְנוֹהִי	עֵינוֹהִי
עֶלְמִיכוֹן	כֹּהֲנִיכוֹן	מֶלְכִיכוֹן	זֶמְנִיכוֹן	עֵינִיכוֹן

VII.

VIII.

a.	b.	
<i>revealer</i>		<i>first</i>
גִּלְא	מְגִלִּי	קִדְמִי
גִּלְא	מְגִלִּי	קִדְמִי
גִּלְיָא	מְגִלְיָא	קִדְמָאָה
גִּלְיִה	מְגִלְיִה	קִדְמִיָּה
גִּלְיוֹן	מְגִלְיוֹן	קִדְמִיָּין
גִּלְי	מְגִלְי	קִדְמִי
גִּלְיָא	מְגִלְיָא	קִדְמִי
גִּלְיִכוֹן	מְגִלְיִכוֹן	קִדְמִיכוֹן

## 2. DECLENSION OF FEMININE NOUNS.

## A.

Singular.			
	a.	b.	c.
	<i>province</i>	<i>army</i>	<i>kingdom</i>
<i>St. absol.</i>	מְדִינָה	מִשְׁרֵי	מַלְכוּ
<i>St. constr.</i>	מְדִינָה	מִשְׁרֵית	מַלְכוֹת
<i>St. emphat.</i>	מְדִינָתָא	מִשְׁרֵיתָא	מַלְכוֹתָא
<i>With suffix.</i>	מְדִינָתָהּ	מִשְׁרֵיתָהּ	מַלְכוֹתָהּ
	מְדִינַתְהוֹן	מִשְׁרֵיתְהוֹן	מַלְכוֹתְהוֹן
Plural.			
<i>St. absol.</i>	מְדִינִין	מִשְׁרֵינ	מַלְכוֹן
<i>St. constr.</i>	מְדִינֹת	מִשְׁרֵית	מַלְכוֹת
<i>St. emphat.</i>	מְדִינָתָא	מִשְׁרֵיתָא	מַלְכוֹתָא
<i>With suffix.</i>	מְדִינַתְהוֹן	מִשְׁרֵיתְהוֹן	מַלְכוֹתְהוֹן

## B.

## C.

Singular.			
	a.	b.	
	<i>widow</i>	<i>discoverer</i>	<i>first</i>
<i>St. absol.</i>	אַרְמָלָה	גְּלִיָּה	קְדָמָא
<i>St. constr.</i>	אַרְמָלַת	גְּלִית	קְדָמַת
<i>St. emphat.</i>	אַרְמָלַתָא	גְּלִיתָא	קְדָמִיתָא (קְדָמִיתָא)
<i>With suffix.</i>	אַרְמָלַתָּהּ	גְּלִיתָהּ	קְדָמִיתָהּ (קְדָמִיתָהּ)
	אַרְמָלַתְהוֹן	גְּלִיתְהוֹן	קְדָמִיתְהוֹן
Plural.			
<i>St. absol.</i>	אַרְמָלָן	גְּלִיָּן	קְדָמָן
<i>St. constr.</i>	אַרְמָלֹת	גְּלִית	קְדָמַת
<i>St. emphat.</i>	אַרְמָלַתָא	גְּלִיתָא	קְדָמִיתָא
<i>With suffix.</i>	אַרְמָלַתְהוֹן	גְּלִיתְהוֹן	קְדָמִיתְהוֹן

§ 34.

*Remarks on the Paradigms of the Nouns.*

1. DECLENSION OF MASCULINE NOUNS.

No. I. embraces all *unchangeable* nouns, i. e. all those which have ה, י, ו, יו before the last consonant. They may consist of only one or of several syllables; e. g. נון *fish*, יום *day*, ראש *head*, אבדן *abode*, אהן *oven*, עולם *youth*, כרז *herald*, קרוב *near*.

No. II. comprehends nouns in ך, without respect to the number of syllables, whether one or more; as, קל *voice*, אה *sign*, שאר *remainder*, עת *time*, אלן *tree*, שולטן *dominion*, פתגם *word*, מעלן *ascent*. a) The ך passes regularly in the stat. constr. into ך, Gen. 3: 22. Exod. 40: 39. Lev. 21: 17. Josh. 6: 19. Deut. 26: 14. Jon. Ezra 6: 19. 7: 18. Dan. 2: 18. Hos. 9: 11. Obad. 14. Esth. 1: 17; on the contrary, see Gen. 3: 10. Joel 2: 5. קל, Ps. 112: 2. דר, 110: 1. אוילן, Dan 6: 8. קרם. — b) Before suffixes which begin with a vowel, it remains unchanged; e. g. לישני Ps. 45: 2, עוברי Ps. 19: 1, שולטן Isa. 22: 21, plur. גבורתי Exod. 15: 4, קורבניהן Ps. 16: 4, Hos. 9: 4, מגליכון Joel 3: 10, מוהבניהן Lev. 23: 31, פתגמיהן Deut. 1: 34 (comp. Exod. 12: 20. Lev. 1: 6. Deut. 28: 12. Jer. 48: 7. Judg. 7: 5). So also it remains in the stat. absol. and emphat. plur., and for the most part in stat. constr. plur. (comp. e. g. אילני Joel 1: 12, 19, עברי Jon. 2: 7, עוברי Exod. 20: 13); only the form קוטל rejects uniformly the vowel; e. g. אוצרני Joel 1: 17, אוצרי 2 Kings 16: 8. 24: 13. — c) Before suffixes which begin with consonants, the punctuation fluctuates between ך and ך; e. g. קלכון Isa. 58: 4, מדרהון Dan. 2: 11, שלמכון Dan. 3: 31, שארהון Jer. 15: 9, רהכון Dan. 2: 9, לישניהון Ps. 5: 10. Gen. 45: 12, which is less surprising, since many of these nouns are already written with ך in the *stat. absol.* sing.

By an unusual mode of inflection, אשה makes in the plur. אשפין, אשפין (from a form אשה in the sing.) Dan. 2: 27. 4: 4. 5: 7 etc.

ען (עאן), the Hebr. צאן, retains regularly its ך before suffixes of every kind; e. g. ענה Gen. 30: 31. 31: 28. Exod. 10: 9, ענהון Exod. 12: 32. Deut. 12: 6. 1 Sam. 8: 17. Isa. 61: 5, ענהון Jer. 3: 24. 34: 28; though before suffixes of the second and third plur., ך is also frequently written; as, ענהון Exod. 10: 24, ענהון Gen. 34: 28. 50: 8, ענהון





מִשַּׁח, קָנָם, קָבַל, פָּרַק, פָּהָן, עָגַל, סָתַר, סָפַר, נָהַר, מִשַּׁח; the vowel  $\text{־}$  in e. g. חָזוּ, נָגַד, חָלָם, עָדַר Dan. 4: 6. 5: 12. Gen. 32: 16. Isa. 53: 2. A *Pattahh* is found in all nouns whose first or second consonant is a guttural, agreeably to the nature of such words; e. g. טָעַם, טָעַמָּא, טָעַם, עָבַד, עָבְדָּא, עָבְדָּא, עָבְדָּא. In regard to בָּרַח, see below § 35.

The proper Chaldee form of nouns like כֹּדֶשׁ is אֹדֶן or אֹדֶן (אֹדֶן) אֹדֶן Job 4: 12 pl. אֹדֶן Ps. 115: 6.

חֲרָה, which also belongs under this Paradigm, has the form חֲרָהִין Cant. 5: 10, along with the regular Plur. חֲרָהִין (so likewise Fem. חֲרָהִין Isa. 66: 22 along with חֲרָהִין).

No. V. comprehends those nouns in which the vowel of the final syllable falls away in the course of inflection, and the third consonant from the end receives then the helping vowel  $\text{־}$  (in gutt.  $\text{־}$ ). To this declension belong the Participles of Ithpeel.

No. VI. embraces those nouns which double their final consonant on the accession of formative syllables and suffixes; as, עַם *people*, יָם *sea*. They are mostly monosyllabic, and derivatives from verbs עָע. The vowels  $\text{־}$ ,  $\text{־}$ , and (yet not always, comp. Num. 25: 15. Ps. 117: 1)  $\text{־}$  pass over into the corresponding short vowels; but in some nouns,  $\text{־}$  is employed instead of  $\text{־}$ , e. g. פָּחָא from פָּחַ, צָרָא from צָר Exod. 19: 23, גִּלְגִּלִּין from גִּלְגֵּל Dan. 7: 9. — In the bibl. Chaldee, כָּל has in the *st. emphat.* כָּלָא (with tone on the penultimate) Dan. 2: 40, on the contrary, with *suffix* כָּלָהִין Dan. 2: 38. 7: 19, in the Targums, commonly  $\text{־}$  instead of  $\text{־}$ , e. g. כּוּלָּה, כּוּלָּא, כּוּלָּהִין Gen. 25: 25. Job 34: 13. Isa. 22: 2. 13: 6, or  $\text{־}$ , as כּוּלָּהִין Mich. 2: 12, כּוּלָּהִין Deut. 4: 22.

No. VII. embraces the derivatives from verbs  $\text{־}$  in  $\text{־}$  (ה־) or  $\text{־}$ ,  $\text{־}$ ,  $\text{־}$ , e. g. גָּלָא, גָּלָא, גָּלָא, גָּלָא, גָּלָא. They consist of participles, infinitives, and nouns. It may be laid down as a general rule that  $\text{־}$  appears as the third radical, and throughout the singular attaches itself to the formative addition or the suff., and is, therefore, movable. In the forms with final  $\text{־}$ , the assumed  $\text{־}$  is consequently displaced, as גָּלָא, גָּלָא, and in such words as גָּלָא, גָּלָא, גָּלָא, a short vowel, in conformity with a well known law of the language, is pronounced under the first radical, e. g. גָּלָא, גָּלָא, גָּלָא, גָּלָא, גָּלָא. The *st. abs. pl.* makes,

according to § 31.2 גִּלְדִּין, מְגִלְדִּין, but also contracted דָּמָן Isa. 42: 2. Jer. 23: 5. Isa. 1: 15. Ezek. 47: 8. Jon. 3: 10. Amos 6: 7. Joel 1: 16. Josh. 9: 20. Gen. 37: 13. 41: 23. Exod. 2: 13. Jon. (more rarely, according to Hebrew analogy, דָּמָן; e. g. Job 1: 13. Lam. 1: 3); but in the *st. constr.* and *emphat.*, every trace of the radical *ד* is lost; e. g. גִּלְדִּי, גִּלְדִּיָּה.

The following are peculiar forms of this declension: עָדִיר *Pl.* with *suff.* עֲדִירוֹן Isa. 10: 2 — עֲדִיר *Pl.* עֲדִירִי Lev. 19: 10 (Onk.) — נָקִיר *Pl.* נָקִירִי Deut. 6: 3. T. H. — גִּדְרָא, גִּדְרָא has a double *Plur.*, גִּדְרִין 1 Sam. 10: 3 and גִּדְרָאִין Deut. 32: 14. Jon. The *stat. constr.* of the first form makes גִּדְרִי Gen. 27: 9.

The *Infin. Peal* of verbs לֹא are either inflected regularly according to this Paradigm, e. g. מַצְבִּירָה Dan. 4: 23, מְחַזְקָה 2 Sam. 13: 6, מְבַנֶּה (*st. emph.*) Ezra 5: 9 — or א of the termination is entirely lost, e. g. מְבַנֶּה 1 Kings 18: 16, מְחַזְקָה 2 Sam. 13: 5, מְחַזְקִין Josh. 8: 3, מְבַנֶּה Gen. 23: 2.

No. VIII. Here belong those nouns which end in the formative syllable *י* (אִי-), see above, § 30. They are mostly gentiles, patronymics, and ordinal numerals. They all have this common property, that *י* is changed in the course of inflection into א, and connects itself, as *littera mobilis*, with the following syllable, in consequence of which the *י* is lengthened into יִ. That the *st. emph. pl.* terminates here in יִ, and, therefore, agrees in form with the *st. constr.*, has been already remarked above. The bibl. Chaldee, however, forms an exception to the last rule; comp. Dan. 2: 5 בְּשָׂרָא 3: 2 חֶפְרָא 3: 8. Ezra 4: 9 טְרַפְלָא and 4: 12, יְהוּדָא.

This Paradigm includes also certain derivatives from לֹא, which terminate in יִ, without being passive Participles (see No. VII); e. g. עֲלִיר *Pl.* עֲלִירִי Gen. 1: 6. T. H. Ps. 104: 13, זִבִּי *st. emphat.* זִבְיָא *Pl.* זִבְיָאִין Jer. 19: 4.

## 2. PARADIGMS OF THE FEMININES.

A. This Paradigm embraces all *unchangeable feminines*, i. e. those in אִי, וִי and יִי, when these final syllables begin with a single consonant, e. g. בְּמָא *height*, עֲצָא *counsel*, גְּבוּרָא *strength*, עֲזָא *sealing-ring*, מְגֻלָּא *roll*, טָבוּ *goodness*, סְגִירָא *dross*, גְּזֻרָא *ordi-*



nance, מַרְבֵּי nurse, רַבּוֹ myriad. Formative syllables and suffixes are appended to such nouns without change.

Nouns of the form קִטְלָא (קִטְרִילָא) exhibit in some editions a variable punctuation, inasmuch as ׀, when the last radical closes the syllable, is sometimes retained, sometimes shortened into ׀; e. g. זִעְרָא Num. 22: 18. Judg. 15: 2 (on the contrary זִעְרָא Gen. 29: 16), שְׁפִלְתָּה Josh. 9: 1. 1 Kings 10: 27, חֲבִרְתָּה Esth. 2: 17. The word נִבְלָא has in the Lond. text a double inflection: a) נִבְלָתָה Jer. 36: 30. 1 Kings 13: 24, נִבְלָתָה Lev. 11: 39, נִבְלָתָה Deut. 28: 26. 1 Kings 13: 22, נִבְלָתָהֶן Lev. 12: 11. 24: 36, נִבְלָתָה Lev. 5: 2. Jer. 16: 18. נִבְלָתָה Lev. 11: 40, נִבְלָתָהֶן Isa. 26: 19. Deut. 14: 8, even נִבְלָתָה Josh. 8: 29; b) נִבְלָתָה 1 Kings 13: 29. Jer. 7: 33, נִבְלָתָה Deut. 21: 22, נִבְלָתָהֶן Lev. 11: 28 (the Hebr. נִבְלָה appears likewise with ׀ purum and impurum, נִבְלָתָה, on the contrary, נִבְלָתָה Isa. 26: 19); עוֹלָמָא, also, in the Lond. text, regularly shortens its ׀, e. g. עוֹלָמָא Gen. 24: 43. Isa. 7: 14. Prov. 30: 19, עוֹלָמָא Exod. 2: 5 (Jahn has עוֹלָמָתָה).

B. To this Paradigm belong all those feminines, the final syllable of which begins with two consonants; e. g. a) סֶאָה (a measure of grain), טִפָּא lip, הַשְׁבָּחָא praise; — b) זִכוּ אֲצִטְלִי σιολή, purity, צִלָּה prayer; — c) מְגִלָּא, מְגִלָּא. Since in the Sing. of nouns like those under a, two vowelless consonants are brought together in one syllable on the accession of the st. emphat., and of the suffixes; e. g. שְׁפָתָא, הַשְׁבָּחָתָא, a short vowel ׀ or ׀ (more rarely ׀) must be inserted under the first of these consonants, e. g. שְׁפָתָא, אֲמָתָא אֲמָא, מְחָתָא מְחָתָא, הַשְׁבָּחָתָא, הַמָּתָא from הָמָא; but if this consonant be א (in nouns which terminate in אָתָּ), the vowel ׀ is assumed, and א quiesces in it; e. g. סֶאָה, סֶאָתָא, פֶּאָה, פֶּאָתָא. The forms under b are inflected regularly in the Sing.; but in the Plur. the same necessity arises, and the supplied vowel is also here ׀ or ׀, e. g. זִכּוּ Pl. זִכּוּן constr. זִכּוּר Deut. 33: 21. Ps. 84: 10.

The form מְגִלָּתָא from מְגִלָּא is peculiar. Nouns like סֶאָה form their Plur. (and Dual) with quiescent א, as סֶאָתָן (סֶאָתָן) or (as if from סֶאָתָן) סֶאָתָן comp. Ezra 6: 17. Gen. 18: 6. 2 Kings 7: 1.

The forms under c are feminines in רָא (derivatives from לָא), as מְגִלָּא (pp. מְגִלָּא), מְגִלָּא. In the stat. emphat. Sing. and before suffixes of the Sing., they receive a furtive vowel, as in the instance just remarked and for the same reason. This vowel is the homogeneous ׀, so that א quiesces in it.

C. Here belong feminines in  $\text{אָ-}$ , which are derived from masculines in  $\text{-}$  (No. VIII.). In the *stat. emphat. Sing.* and *Plur.*, and before *suffixes*, the  $\text{א}$  is changed into  $\text{י}$  *mobile*, yet perhaps oftener into  $\text{-}$  or  $\text{-י}$ ; e. g.  $\text{רְבִיעֶתָּא}$ ,  $\text{קְדִמִּיתָּא}$ ,  $\text{בְּבִלִּיתָּא}$  Lev. 19: 24. 25: 21, 22. Dent. 15: 9 (on the contrary  $\text{רְבִיעֶתָּא}$  Dan. 7: 19). In the *Plur. absol.* and *constr.*, the form  $\text{קְדִמָּא}$ ,  $\text{קְדִמָּא}$  is the usual one, yet there is also found  $\text{נוֹכְרִיָּה}$  Gen. 31: 15.

REM. 1. An affinity exists here, as in Hebrew, between the several declensions of feminine nouns, and their forms are sometimes intermixed with each other; e. g.  $\text{עֲלָא}$  *Pl.*  $\text{עֲלִין}$  (as if from  $\text{עָלוּ}$ ),  $\text{שִׁפָּא}$  *Pl.*  $\text{שִׁפִּין}$ ;  $\text{מְרַגְלִית}$  has in the *Pl.*  $\text{מְרַגְלִין}$  Exod. 28: 10, but also  $\text{מְרַגְלִין}$  Lam. 4: 1. — Nouns in  $\text{-אָ}$  are not numerous in Chaldee, and are inflected as in Hebrew, e. g.  $\text{אַנְרָתָא}$  *stat. emphat.*  $\text{אַנְרָתָא}$ .

REM. 2. When a *feminine* is to be formed from a *masculine* noun (adjective or substantive) by adding the terminations  $\text{-אָ}$  or  $\text{-י}$  and  $\text{-י}$  (*motio nominis*), the vowels which are affected by this removal of the tone, are treated after the manner of the above *Masc. Paradigms* in the *stat. emphat. Sing.*, e. g.  $\text{עוֹלָמָא}$  from  $\text{עוֹלָם}$ ,  $\text{חֲבִירָא}$  from  $\text{חֲבִיר}$  according to No. I.;  $\text{אַמְרָא}$  from  $\text{אַמַּר}$  according to No. II.;  $\text{מְלִכָּא}$  and  $\text{מְלִכּוּתָא}$  from  $\text{מֶלֶךְ}$  according to No. III.;  $\text{צִדְרָא}$  from  $\text{צִדְרִי}$ ,  $\text{יֶאֱרָא}$  from  $\text{יֶאֱרִי}$  (Jer. 46: 20) according to No. VII.

## § 35.

### *Anomalous and Defective Nouns.*

Some nouns, precisely those as a class which were in most common use, deviate more or less in their inflection from the preceding Paradigms; inasmuch as two different ground-forms may be united in *one* word, or, the same ground-form being retained for all relations, it may not subject itself perfectly to the general laws which regulate the declension of nouns. We give the following alphabetical catalogue of such words.

$\text{אַב}$ , *father*, *St. emph.*  $\text{אַבָּא}$ , before *Suff.*  $\text{אַבּוּ}$ , e. g.  $\text{אַבּוּהָא}$ ,  $\text{אַבּוּהִי}$ ,  $\text{אַבּוּהוֹן}$ ,  $\text{אַבּוּכֵן}$ ,  $\text{אַבּוּנָא}$  Gen. 22: 7. 34: 6. Jon.), on the contrary,  $\text{אַבִּי}$  (Dan. 5: 13), *Plur.*  $\text{אַבְרֵן}$ , *constr.*  $\text{אַבְרֵתָּא}$ , *emph.*  $\text{אַבְרֵתָּא}$ , with *Suff.*  $\text{אַבְרֵתָּי}$  *my fathers* (also  $\text{אַבְרֵתָּי}$  Gen. 47: 30),  $\text{אַבְרֵתָּהּ}$ ,  $\text{אַבְרֵתָּכוֹן}$  Exod. 3: 13, on the contrary,  $\text{אַבְרֵתָּהּ}$  Exod. 4: 5.

אָח brother, *St. emph.* אָחא, with *Suff.* אָחִי, אָחוּךְ, אָחוּתִי (אָחִי Gen. 4: 8. T. H.), אָחוּכֹן; *Plur.* אָחִי, with *Suff.* אָחִי, אָחִי thy brothers, אָחִיכֹן.

אָמ mother, *St. emph.* אָמא, *Pl.* אָמִהֶן, with *Suff.* אָמִהֶהוּן Jer. 16: 3. but also אָמִיהוּן Lam. 4: 3.

אָמא maid-servant, *St. emph.* אָמִתָּא, with *Suff.* אָמִתָּךְ Gen. 21: 12, אָמִתָּהִי Job 31: 13; *Pl.* אָמִתָּהֶן, with *Suff.* אָמִתָּהֶהוּ Gen. 12: 16. 20: 17.

אָנִש (contracted נִש) man, *St. emph.* אָנִשָּׁא; *Pl.* אָנִשִּׁין, contracted אָנִשִּׁי Ps. 62: 10, *constr.* אָנִשִּׁי.

אָסִי physician, *St. emph.* אָסִיָּא; *Pl.* אָסִין, *emph.* אָסִוְהָא Gen. 50: 2. אָרִי lion, *St. emph.* אָרִיָּא; *Pl.* אָרִין, *emph.* אָרִיָּהוּ Judg. 14: 5. 2 Kings 17: 25.

אָחָא (אָחָהָא Job 25: 4) in pause אָחָא Gen. 12: 19. Exod. 6: 20 (אָחָהָא) woman, *St. constr.* אָחָה, with *Suff.* אָחָתִי, אָחָתָךְ; *Pl.* נָשִׁין, *emph.* נָשִׁיָּא, *constr.* נָשִׁי.

בֵּית house, *St. emph.* בֵּיתָא (בֵּיתָא), *St. constr.* בֵּית (בֵּי Exod. 7: 28. Jon.); *Pl.* בֵּתִין, *St. emph.* בֵּתִיָּא, *St. constr.* בֵּתִי, with *Suff.* בֵּתָךְ, בֵּתִיכֹן, בֵּתִיָּא.

בֶּר son, *St. emph.* בֶּרָא, with *Suff.* בֶּרֶךְ, בֶּרִיָּה; *Pl.* בֶּרִין (from בֶּן), *St. emph.* בֶּרִיָּא, *constr.* בֶּרִי, with *Suff.* בֶּרִיָּה etc. With this exists also a Syriac form with א prosthet. אֲבִנָּא Prov. 23: 27.

בַּת daughter, *St. emph.* בַּתָּא, *constr.* בַּת (Syr. ܒܬܐ), with *Suff.* בַּתָּךְ, בַּתָּהִי; *Pl.* בַּתִּין (from בַּת), *St. emph.* בַּתָּא, with *Suff.* בַּתָּךְ, בַּתָּהִי.

גֹּו the middle, *St. constr.* גֹּו (גֹּוָא), with *Suff.* גֹּוָה, גֹּוָה.

הָמִיָּה father-in-law, with *Suff.* הָמִיָּה, הָמִיָּה.

טָלִי boy, *St. emph.* טָלִיָּא; *Pl.* טָלִין, טָלִין, *emph.* טָלִיָּא (טָלִי Prov. 1: 4) with *Suff.* טָלִיָּה Gen. 22: 3. Jon.

יָד hand, *St. emph.* יָדָא, with א prosthet. אֲיָדָא, with *Suff.* יָדִי, יָדָךְ, יָדָה; but יָדִיכֹן, יָדִיָּה Isa. 1: 15. Ezra 5: 8; *Pl.* יָדִין (with *Suff.* אֲיָדִי Prov. 21: 1).

נְבִיָּא prophet, *St. emph.* נְבִיָּא; *Pl.* נְבִיָּאִין, *constr.* נְבִיָּי 1 Kings 18: 19, *emph.* נְבִיָּא, with *Suff.* נְבִיָּה, נְבִיָּהִי 1 Kings 22: 22 sq.

עַמִּי people, *Pl.* עַמִּין (as in Syr.), *emph.* עַמִּיָּא.



פֵּרִי *fruit*, *Pl.* פֵּרִיךָ Gen. 1: 11 or פֵּרוֹת, but with *Suff.* פֵּרֶי Prov. 8: 19.

קָרַי *city*, *St. emph.* קָרָא Prov. 8: 3, קָרָא Gen. 49: 11. קָרִיתָא Ezra 4: 15, קָרָא, קִירָא (in T. H.), (with *Suff.* קָרִיתָהוּ Gen. 34: 20), *Pl.* קָרִיִּין (with *Suff.* קָרִיִּיכוֹן, קָרִיִּיחוֹן Isa. 1: 27. Josh. 9: 17), *St. absol.* קָרִינָא Jer. 36: 6, also קִירִיִּין, קִירִיִּן, *St. emph.* קִירִיתָא.

רִישׁ *head*, *St. emph.* רִישָׁא; *Pl.* רִישֵׁין, once after the Hebr. formation ראשִׁיהוּם Ezra 5: 10.

שֵׁם *name*, *St. emph.* שְׁמָא, with *Suff.* שְׁמָהוּן Ps. 16: 4; *Pl.* שְׁמָהוֹן, *constr.* שְׁמָהָת, with *Suff.* שְׁמָהָהוּן Gen. 2: 20. 25: 16.

### § 36.

#### *Adjectives and Numerals.*

1. Adjectives are treated in their inflection, not as a distinct class of words, but according to their form; and hence, as there is no adjective form which does not belong also to substantives, it follows that their mode of declension has been already illustrated in the table of the nouns. But though the characteristics of adjectives are the same as those of substantives, the reverse is not true, that there are no substantive forms which are not found at the same time among adjectives. The most frequent forms of the latter are: קָטַל, קָטִיל, קָטִיל, less common קָטַל, קִיטַל; many also, which are formed from other nouns, end in *־י* and *־ן*.

The Chaldee, like the Hebrew, has no separate forms for comparison; the manner in which the degrees of comparison are expressed by the use of other words and circumlocution, is explained in § 58. of the Syntax.

2. The Numerals are divided into cardinal and ordinal; for the distributive and multiplicative numbers are denoted by circumlocution (§ 59). The Cardinals have the same peculiarity as in Hebrew, viz. that from 3 to 10 the *feminines* have a masculine ending, while the *masculines* have a feminine ending. From 20 to 100 inclusive, only *one* form is constantly employed for both genders. The cardinal numerals from 1 to 10 are, in both genders and states, as follows.

<i>St. constr.</i>		<i>St. absol.</i>	
Fem.	Masc.	Fem.	Masc.
1. <b>אֶחָד</b>	<b>אֶחָד</b>	<b>אֶחָדָא</b>	<b>אֶחָד</b>
2. <b>אֶחָדִי</b>	<b>אֶחָדִי</b>	<b>אֶחָדִין</b>	<b>אֶחָדִין</b>
3. <b>אֶחָדִי</b>	<b>אֶחָדִי</b>	<b>אֶחָדָא</b>	<b>אֶחָדָא</b>
4. <b>אֶרְבַּעִי</b>	<b>אֶרְבַּעַת (אֶרְבַּעַת)</b>	<b>אֶרְבַּע</b>	<b>אֶרְבַּעָא (אֶרְבַּעָא)</b>
5. <b>חֲמִשָּׁתִּי</b>	<b>חֲמִשָּׁת</b>	<b>חֲמִשָּׁ</b>	<b>חֲמִשָּׁא</b>
6. <b>שֵׁשֶׁתִּי</b>	<b>שֵׁשֶׁת</b>	<b>שֵׁשֶׁת (שֵׁשֶׁת)</b>	<b>שֵׁשֶׁתָא</b>
7. <b>שִׁבְעִי</b>	<b>שִׁבְעַת</b>	<b>שִׁבְעָא (שִׁבְעָא)</b>	<b>שִׁבְעָא (שִׁבְעָא)</b>
	(Gen. 3: 14. Jon. 3: 1)		
8. <b>חֲמִנִיתִי</b>	<b>חֲמִנִית</b>	<b>חֲמִנִי</b>	<b>חֲמִנִיאָא</b>
9. <b>תְּשַׁעִי</b>	<b>תְּשַׁעַת</b>	<b>תְּשַׁע</b>	<b>תְּשַׁעָא</b>
10. <b>עֶסְרִי</b>	<b>עֶסְרַת</b>	<b>עֶסְרָא (עֶסְרָא)</b>	<b>עֶסְרָא (עֶסְרָא)</b>

With **אֶחָדִי**, suffixes are frequently connected; and this numeral assumes then the form **אֶחָדִי**, e. g. **אֶחָדִי** *they both* Gen. 2: 52, **אֶחָדִי** *ye both* Gen. 27: 45. Gen. 4: 8. **אֶחָדִי** *we both*. In the case of other numerals, this takes place more rarely, e. g. Ezek. 1: 8 **אֶרְבַּעִי**.

The tens from 30—90 are denoted, as in Hebr., by the plurals of the cardinals 3—9, e. g. **אֶחָדִין** 30, **אֶרְבַּעִין** 40, **חֲמִשִּׁין** 50, **שֵׁשִׁין** 60, **שִׁבְעִין** 70, **חֲמִנִין** 80 (**חֲמִנִין** i. e. **חֲמִנִין** Exod. 7: 7. Num. 4: 48 or **חֲמִנִין** Josh. 14: 10. 1 Sam. 22: 18. Jer. 41: 5 etc.), **תְּשַׁעִין** 90. The number 20 is expressed by the plural of the number 10, namely **עֶסְרִין** (Gen. 18: 31. Num. 3: 30. Dan. 6: 1). All these Plurals are *Gen. comm.*

The expression for 100 is **מֵאָה**, for 200 **מֵאָהִין** or **מֵאָהִין**, for 300 **מֵאָהִין**, for 400 **מֵאָהִין** etc. (i. e. with units prefixed in the masculine form). The expression for 1000 is **אֶלֶף** masc., for 2000 **אֶלֶפִין**, for 3000 **אֶלֶפִין** etc. (i. e. with units prefixed in the feminine form); for 10,000 **רַבּוֹ** fem., for 120,000 **רַבּוֹ** (Jon. 4: 11) comp. Ezek. 48: 35.

The intermediate numbers 11—19 are formed by a union of the units with **עֶסְרִי** *Masc.* and **עֶסְרִי** *Fem.*, in reference to which, however, it is to be remarked: 1) That the units do not all retain in this connection their appropriate form; 2) That in the later Tar-

gums (especially of Pseudo-Jon. and T. H.) the units with עָסָר (עֶסְרָא) and עָסְרִי are sometimes contracted into *one* word. The following table exhibits a complete view of both these combinations.

<i>Fem.</i>		<i>Masc.</i>	
11. יָחַד עָסְרִי	(יְחָדְסְרִי)	יָחַד עָסָר	(יְחָדְסָר)
12. יָחַד עָסְרִי, תְּרֵינִי, תְּרֵינָא עָסְרִי	(תְּרֵינִי עָסְרִי)	תְּרֵי עָסָר	(תְּרֵינִי עָסָר)
13. תְּלָת עָסְרִי	(תְּלִינִי עָסְרִי)	תְּלָת עָסָר or תְּלָתָא עָסָר	{ תְּלִינִי עָסָר תְּלִינִי עָסָר }
14. אַרְבַּע עָסְרִי	(אַרְבַּעִי עָסְרִי)	{ אַרְבַּעַת עָסָר אַרְבַּעַת עָסָר }	{ אַרְבַּעִי עָסָר אַרְבַּעִי עָסָר }
15. חֲמִשָּׁה עָסְרִי	(חֲמִישִׁי עָסְרִי)	חֲמִשָּׁה עָסָר	(חֲמִישִׁי עָסָר)
16. שֵׁשׁ עָסְרִי or שֵׁשֶׁת עָסְרִי	(שֵׁשֶׁת עָסְרִי)	שֵׁשֶׁת עָסָר	(שֵׁשֶׁת עָסָר)
17. שִׁבְעָה עָסְרִי	(שִׁבְעִי עָסְרִי)	שִׁבְעָה עָסָר	(שִׁבְעִי עָסָר)
18. תְּמִנָּה עָסְרִי or תְּמִנִּי עָסְרִי	(תְּמִנִּי עָסְרִי)	תְּמִנָּה עָסָר { תְּמִנָּה תְּמִנָּה }	(תְּמִנִּי עָסָר)
19. תִּשְׁעָה עָסְרִי	{ תִּשְׁעִי עָסְרִי תִּשְׁעִי עָסְרִי }	תִּשְׁעָה עָסָר	(תִּשְׁעִי עָסָר)

The unit stands sometimes in the *stat. constr.*, e. g. Lev. 23: 6 חֲמִשָּׁה עָסְרָא: Num. 28: 17 חֲמִשָּׁה עָסְרָא; Exod. 12: 6 אַרְבַּעַת עָסְרָא.

The intermediate numbers 21—29, 31—39 etc. are denoted by a union of the tens תְּלָתִין, עָסְרִין with the units, in which case the latter stand last and are connected with the tens by ו, e. g. 21 עָסְרִין וַיְחָד *Masc.* and יָחַד עָסְרִין *Fem.*; 28 עָסְרִין וַיְחֲמִשָּׁה *Masc.* and יָחַד עָסְרִין וַיְחֲמִשָּׁה *Fem.*; 35 *Masc.* תְּלָתִין וַיְחֲמִשָּׁה Num. 1: 37. Comp. Gen. 12: 11. 5: 15. Num. 2: 11. 3: 46. Exod. 38: 28. Jer. 52: 28. For examples of the greater numbers, compounded of tens and units (as 365, 3023, 45650), see Gen. 5: 23. Jer. 52: 28. Num. 1: 25. Exod. 38: 28 etc.

3. The ordinals 3—10 (comp. 1 Chron. 24: 7 sq. 27: 4 sq.) are formed from the above cardinals by adding to them the termination -י (אִי) *Masc.* and -יָא (אִיָּא) *emphat.* or -יָא (אִיָּא) *Fem.*; but for *primus* and *secundus*, a special word is employed, namely for the former בְּרִיחִי, for the latter תְּנִיחִי (derived most directly from תְּנִיחִי). Yet the cardinals stand also in certain cases for the ordinals; see § 59. 3.



<i>Fem.</i>		<i>Masc.</i>	
absol.	emphat.	absol.	emphat.
3. חֲלִיתָא	חֲלִיתָאָה	חֲלִיתָי (חֲלִיתִי Dan. 5: 7)	חֲלִיתָאָה (חֲלִיתֶּךָ Ezra 6: 4)
4. רְבִיעָא	רְבִיעָאָה (רְבִיעָתָא)	רְבִיעֵי	רְבִיעָאָה (רְבִיעֶיךָ)
5. חֲמִישָׁא	חֲמִישָׁאָה	חֲמִישֵׁי	חֲמִישָׁאָה
6. —	שְׁתֵּיתָא (שְׁתֵּי Gen. 30:19)	שְׁתֵּיתִי	שְׁתֵּיתָאָה
7. —	שְׁבִיעָא (שְׁבִיעָתָא)	שְׁבִיעֵי	שְׁבִיעָאָה
8. —	חֲמִינָא	חֲמִינֵי	חֲמִינָאָה
9. —	חֲשִׁיעָא	חֲשִׁיעֵי	חֲשִׁיעָאָה
10. —	עֲסִירָא	עֲסִירֵי	עֲסִירָאָה

The ordinals from 20 and onward are expressed as in Hebrew, by the corresponding cardinals; comp. Num. 7: 72. Jer. 39: 2. Esth. 9: 17. 1 Kings 16: 23 and elsewhere.

But the intermediate numbers 11—19 etc. may be formed by uniting the ordinal 10 with the cardinal units, in which case the latter stand first, and עֲסִירֵי being contracted, coalesces with them so as to make *one* word; e. g. חֲדָסְרִי *eleventh*, Num. 25: 8. Jon., תְּרִיסְרָא (תְּרִיסְרָאִי) *twelfth*, *thirteenth* חֲלִיסְרָאָה 1 Chron. 24: 13, *Fem.* תְּלֹסְרִיא or תְּלִיסְרִיא Gen. 2: 21. Jon., אַרְבִּסְרָאָה *fourteenth*, *fifteenth* חֲמִיסְרָאָה, *sixteenth* שִׁיסְרָאָה, *seventeenth* שְׁבִיסְרָאָה, *eighteenth* חֲמִנִיסְרָאָה, *nineteenth* חֲשִׁיסְרָאָה (1 Chron. 24: 14 sq.). Yet in designations of time (the eleventh year, month, etc.) the compound cardinals above enumerated are usually selected; comp. § 59, 3.

On the mode of expressing *distributives* and numeral *adverbs*, see Syntax § 59. 4, 5.

## CHAPTER V.

## The Particles.

The Chaldee particles divide themselves into two classes, one of which embraces those that were originally employed for this purpose; the other, those that were transferred to this use from other parts of speech in the progress of the language. The latter compose by far the greater number, inasmuch as the relations which are expressed by particles, were viewed by the orientals, for the most part, not abstractly, but with concrete vividness (i. e. as substantive and verbal ideas). The former, again, are of two kinds, either *primitive* and, therefore, their own stems, e. g. לָא, וְ, אִי, אִי, or *derived* from a stem-word (without, however, so far as we can trace the language, having ever performed any other office than that of particles), e. g. כְּדָם, מִן, עַל.

## § 37.

## Adverbs.

1. The following may be considered as *primitive*: אָן *where?* מַתַּי *when?* לָא *not*, אַה *also*.

2. *Derivative* (from nouns) with a characteristic ending are: יוֹמָא *by day*, יוֹמָא *to-day*, אַסְפְּרָנָא *anxiously*, מִסְרָה־בְּאִית *in haste*, תְּנִינִית *again*.

3. *Transferred* adverbs (i. e. from other parts of speech which still exist as such) are: a) Verbal forms (Infinitives or Participles), e. g. חֵיב *again* (revertendo), מִפְּרֵצַ *backwards*. b) Pronouns and nouns, sometimes with prepositions, e. g. כְּדִין *so*, לְהַדָּא *much, very*, בְּהַדָּא *at the same time*, (comp. *at one, together*), מִיָּד *immediately, (off hand)*; sometimes without addition or change, as בֵּן *(firm) certain, right*, קִשְׁטָא *rightly*, כָּלֵל *entirely*, הַשְׁתָּא *now* (הַשְׁעָה *this hour*).

Expressions like בְּתַקוּף *violently*, בְּקִיצוֹר *shortly*, בְּפְרִיז *every mo-*

*ment*, בְּקוֹשָׁטָא *sincerely*, or even מִן קֶשֶׁט (*ἐξ ἀληθείας*), לְשָׁקְרָא *in vain* (1 Sam. 25: 21) do not, according to oriental feeling, present merely a single idea, but the substantive and the preposition retain still their separate force, as in our language, *in truth, with violence*, etc. This can be denominated only a periphrasis of the adverb; and in this manner its place may be supplied by forms of the verb. The consideration of this usage belongs to the Syntax, comp. § 52.

Compound *adverbs* are: מָכָּא אֵיכְדְּרִין *how?* אֵימְתִּי *ecquando?* מִכָּא *hence* (from מִן and כָּא), מֵהֵרָא *whence?* מִתָּחַ *thence*. The *Adv.* אֵיָּה and the compound לֵיָּה (from לָא and אֵיָּה) express, united with *pronouns*, the verb *to be, not to be*, see above, § 8. Rem. 2.

In reference to the interrogative adverbs, it is to be remarked, that the *simple question* is indicated by the prefix הֵ (but before a vowelless consonant and before א, ה), e. g. הֵלֵבֵר, הֵמְקַטֵּל, הֵלֵא Gen. 17: 17. Dan. 3: 24. Jer. 26: 19. Exod. 3: 7. Jon. (הֵאֲוִיל). — When *pronouns* or *adverbs* are to receive an interrogative signification, אֵי is prefixed to them, e. g. אֵי מִנֵּן *whence?* אֵי אֲלוֹ *who?* אֵי כְּדִין *how?* — Before interrogative adverbs, אֵי possesses merely an intensive force, e. g. אֵי מִתִּי *when then?*

## § 38.

*Prepositions.*

1. Original prepositions are, *a*) the *inseparabiles* בְּ, כְּ, לְ, which are always united with a noun or a pronoun. They are pointed with ׀ before a consonant which has a vowel, but in other cases with ׀, or before *Sheva compos.* with the short vowel which corresponds to such *Sheva*; e. g. בְּסֶפֶר, כְּאָנֶשׁ, לְעֵנִי. In the latter case, contraction sometimes takes place, e. g. בְּאַלְהֵהָ Dan. 6: 24. לְאַלְהֵא Dan. 5: 23 (on the contrary, לְאַלְהָ Ezra 6: 9). See above § 24. — *b*) The monosyllabic *separabiles* עַל, מִן, עִם, לְנֶחַד, כְּמֶת, כְּנֶחַד. — As *transferred prepositions* occur: חֲלֹוָה *instead of*, תַּחְתּוֹת *under*, בְּתֵר *after* (i. e. בְּאַתֵּר *in the place*), בְּלֵא *without*.

בְּ is sometimes written as an independent word בִּי Cant. 1: 9, 13, from which, however, it could not be inferred, that this preposition is a contraction from בֵּית or בֵּין. Single prefixed letters could be em-



ployed for such simple relations as  $\text{כ}$ ,  $\text{ב}$ , etc. express, as well as for the cases of nouns; besides, it is with violence only, that  $\text{כ}$  can be referred to a separate word; while  $\text{ו}$  is entirely opposed to such an artificial view).

2. Of prepositions that were originally nouns, or, though derived from verbs, assume the forms of nouns, some appear before suffixes: *a*) as feminine forms, e. g.  $\text{אֶמְטֹלְתִּי}$ ,  $\text{מְטֹלְתָּנָא}$  Job 3: 23. Ps. 115: 1 (but before  $\text{הוּן}$  and  $\text{כוּן}$   $\text{מְטֹלְהוּן}$  Ps. 106: 26. 58: 8); — *b*) others as plurals, 1) always:  $\text{עַל}$ , e. g.  $\text{עָלֶיךָ}$  Dan. 3: 12,  $\text{עָלוּהִי}$  1 Kings 13: 3,  $\text{עָלֶיהוּן}$  Exod. 6: 9,  $\text{עָלֶיכוֹן}$  Ezra 5: 1;  $\text{קָדָם}$ , e. g.  $\text{קָדָמִי}$  Dan. 2: 9,  $\text{קָדָמֵיכוֹן}$  Josh. 9: 24,  $\text{קָדָמֵיהוּן}$  Jer. 36: 15,  $\text{קָדָמוּהִי}$  Dan. 7: 13;  $\text{מֵאַחֹר}$ , e. g.  $\text{מֵאַחֲרוֹהִי}$  2 Sam. 10: 9,  $\text{מֵאַחֲרָהָא}$  Ezek. 2: 10; — 2) frequently:  $\text{בֵּין}$ , e. g.  $\text{בֵּינָהּ}$ ,  $\text{בֵּינוֹהִי}$  ( $\text{בֵּינָא}$  for  $\text{בֵּינִי}$  *inter me* Gen. 31: 44. Jon. 1 Sam. 24: 16);  $\text{בְּתֵרִי}$ , e. g.  $\text{בְּתֵרִי}$ ,  $\text{בְּתֵרִי}$  Gen. 24: 5. 17: 19;  $\text{גַּב}$  ( $\text{גִּבִּי}$ ), e. g.  $\text{גִּבִּי}$  and  $\text{גַּבִּי}$  Job 19: 4. 10: 17,  $\text{חֲלוּפָהּ}$ , e. g.  $\text{חֲלוּפָהּ}$  and  $\text{חֲלוּפָהָא}$  Judg. 15: 2. Job 28: 15,  $\text{חֲלוּפָהּ}$  and  $\text{חֲלוּפָוּהִי}$  1 Kings 21: 2. 2: 35;  $\text{חֲחוּתִי}$ , e. g.  $\text{חֲחוּתִי}$  and  $\text{חֲחוּתָהּ}$  2 Sam. 22: 37. Gen. 2: 21.

The Prepos.  $\text{מִן}$  either stands as a separate word ( $\text{מִן מִדְּבָרָהּ}$ ), or is pronounced in immediate connection with the nouns which it accompanies. Before such words as begin with an ordinary consonant,  $\text{נ}$  is assimilated to the following letter; e. g.  $\text{מִיָּדֶךָ}$ ,  $\text{מִיָּדֶיךָ}$ ; before gutturals it is pronounced  $\text{מִ}$ , as in Hebrew, e. g.  $\text{מִמְּאֲרָעָא}$ ,  $\text{מִמְּחִימִשׁ}$ . Before suffixes, this preposition is constantly pointed  $\text{מִנִּי}$ , e. g.  $\text{מִנִּי}$ ,  $\text{מִנִּיכוֹן}$ ,  $\text{מִנִּיהוּן}$ .

Compound prepositions are  $\text{מִלְּפָנֶיךָ}$  ( $\text{מִלְּפָנֶיךָ}$ ),  $\text{מִלְּפָנֶיךָ}$ ,  $\text{מִלְּפָנֶיךָ}$ , the latter before *infinitives* (Isa. 1: 6  $\text{מִלְּאֲבָאֲשָׁא}$ , 1 Sam. 1: 6  $\text{מִלְּמִקְטֵל}$ ),  $\text{בְּגִין}$  and  $\text{בְּדִיל}$  *on account of*,  $\text{לְמִן}$ ,  $\text{מִצֵּל}$ ,  $\text{מֵאַחֹר}$ , and the like.

## § 39.

### *Conjunctions and Interjections.*

1. *Original* conjunctions are:  $\text{ו}$  *and*,  $\text{כ}$  *as, when*,  $\text{יֵהּ}$  *if*,  $\text{בֵּד}$  *since*,  $\text{אוּ}$  *or*; *derivative* are:  $\text{בְּרָם}$  *but*,  $\text{לְתֵן}$  *therefore*,  $\text{דִּי}$  *that*; *compound*:  $\text{לֹא דִי}$  *or*,  $\text{דִּלְמָא}$  *in order not*,  $\text{עַד דִּי}$  *until that*,  $\text{חֲלָהּ}$  and  $\text{בְּדִיל}$  *on this account*,  $\text{עַל דִּין}$  *because that*,  $\text{כִּינֵן}$  *after, inasmuch*.

2. The *conjunctiones inseparabiles*,  $\text{כ}$  and  $\text{ד}$ , are prefixed accord-

ing to the same laws, as the *praepositiones inseparabiles* (§ 38. 1); but ו takes the vowel sound ו (as in Hebr.) before a consonant with simple Sheva and before ה, מ, ב (Dan. 4: 12. 7: 22).

3. The interjections are for the most part *onomatopoëtica*, e. g. **הא** *behold!* **לֹאִי** *would that (utinam)!* **וֹי** *wo! alas! (vae).* On the other hand, derived from other parts of speech, are: **בְּכַעֲוִי** (i. e. *on request*) *quaeso*, **חֲבֹל** *alas!* (comp. *perii!*), **הָבוּ** *come on, (agite, imp. from ירהב).*

With **הא** *behold*, the personal pronoun of the first Pers. sing. is sometimes united into one word **הָאֲנִי** *behold I* (here am I) Gen. 22: 11. Jon. (Onk. **אֲנִי**); on the contrary, the other pronouns, even in the later Targums, are used with it separately, e. g. Gen. 20: 3 **הָאֵל אֲנִי**, 47: 1 **הָאֵל הִנֵּנִי**, Josh. 9: 25 **הָאֲנִי**. Comp. further the contraction Deut. 1: 10 **הָאֵלֶּיכֶם** *ecce vos estis*.

## PART III.

# S Y N T A X .

---

### CHAPTER I.

#### The Pronoun.

##### § 40.

#### *Use of the Personal and Possessive Pronoun.*

1. The separate personal pronouns, when they form the subject of a sentence, include the substantive verb, e. g. 1 Sam. 9: 21 אָנָּא בֶּן־מִינֵי בִנְיָמִין *a son of the tribe of Benjamin (am) I*, Gen. 42: 14. Jon. אַתְּ אֵלַי אַתְּוֹן *spies (are) ye* Gen. 34: 23. Jon. דִּילְקָנָא אֵינוֹן *(are) they not ours?* Num. 14: 40 אַנְהֹנָא סִלְקִין *we are going up (we go up)*, Gen. 6: 2. Jon. שְׁפִירָן הֵנוּן *(הֵנוּן) they are fair*. So also מָה אֵנוֹן signifies *what are they?* Ezra 5: 4. Zach. 1: 9. 1 Sam. 25: 10. The pronouns of the third Pers., where the subject of the sentence is the first or second Pers., sometimes supply the place of the copula, e. g. Ezra 5: 11 אֲנִיָּהּ דִּי אֵלֶּה *we are servants*, etc. Dan. 2: 38, אַנְהֹתָ הוּא רִאשָׁה דִּי רִהָבָא *thou art the head*, etc.

2. *Separate pronouns* as well as suffixes are often used incorrectly in respect to *gender*, e. g. Ruth 1: 8, 9 עֲמֻכּוֹן (said of the daughters-in-law of Naomi), or are constructed according to the sense, e. g. Jon. 1: 3 עֲמֻהֹן which refers to the seamen, the idea being already implied in אֵלֶּפָא. The plural forms also (in many editions) are frequently employed instead of the *Sing.*, from which they distinguish themselves for the most part only by the *scriptio plena*, e. g. מְלָכִיהֹן Ps. 149: 2 instead of מְלָכִיהָ, מְלָכִיהֹן Num. 24: 7. Exod. 31: 4. Jon.



There is no enallage of number Gen. 3: 18. Jon. and T. H. בְּלִיעִיתָּרְרִי. The suffix *my* (not *our*) is selected with reference to the fact, that labor belongs more immediately to the man as head and supporter of the family.

3. The *suffixes* are often used pleonastically (though not so frequently, as in Syriac, comp. Hoffmann, p. 316), namely, in the following three cases: *a*) In connection with a noun which governs a Genitive, e. g. Gen. 7: 10. Jon. אֹבְבָלָה דְּמִתּוּשָׁלַח, Gen. 19: 38. Onk. אַבְוִיחֹן דִּי בְנֵי עֲמוֹן, Dan. 3: 8. אֲרַצִּיחֹן דִּי יְהוּדִיָּא, 3: 9. רוּחָה דִּי רְבִיעָא, 3: 25. לְשָׁנִיָּה דְּצַדִּיקָא, Dan. 2: 20. 3: 26. Prov. 16: 13. 12: 3. 13: 24. Jer. 23: 26. Jon. 2: 4. Gen. 3: 15. Jon. (comp. in English *the rich their pride*, etc.);—*b*) In connection with a preposition which follows immediately with the noun itself, e. g. Ezra 4: 11. עֲלוּהִי עַל אֲרַחֲחִשְׁתָּא, Dan. 5: 12. בַּהּ בְּדִנְיָאֻל.—*c*) Less frequently in dependence on a verb, where the object-noun likewise follows (Hos. 13: 1. אֲחִיד לְחֹן לְעַמִּיָּא.)

4. The repetition of the pronoun in cases like בְּרַבְנֵי אָה לִי Gen. 27: 34, is not an instance of pleonasm. For this is more emphatically expressed, than simply to have said בְּרַבְנֵי, comp. further Gen. 20: 5. A similar emphasis is intended, where the separate pronoun is repeated after the suffix, Ezra 7: 21. מִנִּי אָנָּא אֲרַחֲחִשְׁתָּא. Dan. 7: 15. The latter idiom occurs when a substantive precedes, e. g. Gen. 4: 26. Jon. לִישָׁת אָה הוּא אֲתִילִיד.

5. The suffix of the noun denotes often the object, as רַחֲלָתָהּ *his fear*, i. e. fear on account of him, Exod. 20: 20, אַנְדָּה *its* (the ship's) *hire*, i. e. the money to be paid for the ship, for conveyance in it;—the verbal suffix expresses commonly the Accusative. To this, however, there are some exceptions, e. g. Dan. 5: 6. יִוְדָהִי שְׁנוּדָהִי *his form was changed in him* (v. 9, עֲלוּהִי).

6. The possessive pronouns *my, thine*, etc. are expressed in Chaldee not only by means of the noun-suffixes (§ 8, 3), but by separate forms, derived from דִּיל and the suffixes of the verb, as דִּילִי *my*, דִּילָהּ *his*, דִּילָנוּ *our*, etc., see § 8, 3. Rem. 1. It is to be remarked further as a peculiarity here, that instead of *my father*, it is customary to say merely *the father* (as often at present in German, and in the older English), e. g. Gen. 31: 42. אֵלֶּהָ דְּאָבָא *the*

*God* of the (my) father, 19: 34. 20: 12. 27: 12. Ex. 18: 4. Judges 6: 15 etc. So also in the Vocative *father*, not *my father*, Gen. 22: 7. 27: 34.

7. Two words, standing in the relation of Genitive to each other, are regarded as *one* idea; hence the suffix attaches itself to the second, e. g. Lev. 26: 38 בְּעֵלֵי דָבָרִיכֶם *your foes*, Is. 56: 7 בֵּית צְלוֹתִי *my house of prayer*, Joel 2: 28. רֹאשׁ קִדְשִׁי *my holy mount*.

### § 41.

#### *Use of the Relative Pronoun.*

1. The form of the relative pronoun דִּי or דְּ expresses directly of itself only the Nominative or Accusative, (e. g. Exod. 32: 34. Num. 20: 12. Gen. 3: 9. Jon. Joel 3: 2); yet the latter is also designated, especially where an ambiguity is to be avoided, by adding the personal suffix to the verb, e. g. Ps. 1: 4 דִּי תִשְׁקַפֶּנָּה *quem dispellit*. The Dative *cui* appears in its simplest form in דְּלָה Deut. 4: 8; yet the Dative and Genitive of the relative are usually expressed by means of the personal pronoun, placed after דִּי or דְּ, which serves then merely to give a relative signification to the pronoun, e. g. Deut. 28: 49. עַמָּא דִּי לֹא תִשְׁמַע לִישָׁנָה *whose language thou wilt not understand*, Ps. 144: 8. דִּי פּוֹמְהוֹן מִמֶּלֶל *whose mouth speaketh*, Deut. 8: 8. Here דִּי, דְּ is manifestly a mere sign of relation, precisely as when it occurs in connection with prepositions which are prefixed to a pronoun, and which may be joined immediately to the relative; as, Obad. 8 דְּבַה *in which*, or, which is more common, may follow at a distance in the sentence, Exod. 6: 4 אֶרֶץ דְּאֶהוּרָבוּ בָּהּ *land in which*, Isa. 43: 7 דְּאֶתְקַרֵּי *from which*, 1 Kings 18: 15 דִּי מִשְׁמִשְׁנָא קִדְמוֹתִי *before whom I serve*, Deut. 1: 22 קִרְיֹת דִּי נֵעוּל לְרַחֲמֵי *cities to which we*, etc., Jer. 1: 2 דְּחָא פָּחֵם נְבוּזָא עִמָּה *with whom*, etc. In the last case, however, the personal pronoun with its preposition is sometimes wanting, especially when the preposition has occurred already in connection with the antecedent to which the relative belongs. Gen. 3: 5 דְּחִיכְלוֹן דִּיּוֹמָא *on the day on which*, Gen. 35: 13. דְּמִלֵּל עִמָּה *in the place in which (we)*, 1 Sam. 25: 15 sq. But, as de-

signations of place and time in general are expressed (§ 57. 1) without a preposition, the relative stands in this case alone, e. g. Joel 2: 25 אֲשֶׁלֶם לְכוֹן שְׁנֵי זָבָהָא חֲלָה שְׁנֵי דְבִי רְחוּן עֲמִיָּא *instead of the years which (in which) they plundered you*, etc. Exod. 5: 11.

2. When the *relative* is connected with adverbs, it gives them a relative sense; e. g. Gen. 13: 3 רָמֵן דְּפָרְסָה *where*, also Exod. 20: 21 דְּרָמֵן, Gen. 3: 22 מִתַּחַן דְּאֶתְרִי *unde (e terra) creatum est* (v. 19 דְּמִנָּה).

3. It is frequently necessary to supply the pronoun *he, that*, etc. before the relative, especially when a preposition or a sign of the case is connected with the *relative*, e. g. Mich. 2: 1 לְמַעַבְר דְּבִישׁ *to do that which is evil*, Num. 22: 6 רַח דִּי הִכְרַךְ *(he) whom thou blessest*, Exod. 15: 7 לְדָרְסָה דְּהִרְתָּ *those who had lifted themselves up*, Gen. 43: 16 לְדִימְנָא אֲבִי *to him who*, Gen. 31: 1 לְאֲבוּנָא קִנָּא *from that which (belongs) to our father*, etc., Gen. 4: 8. Jon. מִיִּדְרָה *better than those who*, etc. Gen. 43: 11. 1 Sam. 25: 8. So also in designations of time and place, e. g. Num. 21: 19 מִדְּאֶתְהִיבָה *since he had been born*, Gen. 3: 24. Jon. מִן דְּאֶשְׁרִי וְקִר שְׁכֻנָּה.

4. The *relative* is sometimes omitted, when it would regularly be repeated (though less frequently in Chaldee than among the Hebrews), e. g. Isa. 43: 7 אֶתְהִיבֵן דְּאֶתְקִרִי שְׁמִי עֲלֵיהוֹן וְלִיקִרִי בְּרִיתִינוֹן *et (quos) creavi (but Dan. 7: 27 does not belong under this rule as Lengerke supposes; it is to be translated—his kingdom is an everlasting kingdom.*

Where in Hebrew אֲשֶׁר is omitted after a *stat. constr.*, e. g. Exod. 4: 13 בִּידֵי הַשֵּׁלֶחַ, the Targums are accustomed to place not only the *relative*, but more fully מִן דְּ, e. g. לְמַשְׁלַח בִּידֵי מִן *by the hand of him who is expert*, etc. Lam. 1: 14 בִּידֵי מִן דְּלִית רְכִיל וְגו'.

5. The *relative* is employed, in not a few instances, with a sort of redundancy, where it might be omitted; e. g. הֵיכְלָא דִּי בִירוּשָׁלַם *the temple which is in Jerusalem* Dan. 5: 2, בִּירְתָא דִּי בְּמִדִּי *the citadel which is in Media* Ezra 6: 2.



## § 42.

*Use of the Demonstrative and Interrogative Pronoun.*

1. When the demonstrative occurs twice in succession, connected by the *copula* ו, it is to be translated *this* and *that* (similar in Latin is *hic et hic* for *hic et ille*), Dan. 4: 6. 7: 3.

2. The feminine of the demonstrative supplies sometimes the place of the neuter, Joel 1: 2 דָּא - דָּא הִיאָהוּתָא *hear this—whether* etc. 3: 9. 2 Chron. 25: 16. Nah. 19: 14 ; דָּא *all this* Gen. 41: 39. Jon. *Therefore* is commonly expressed by עַל יֵרִין, and *thus* (secundum hoc) by כִּדְרִין.

3. The interrogative pronoun is to be taken as Genitive, when a noun in the form of the *stat. constr.* immediately precedes ; e. g. Gen. 24: 23 בַּת מִן אֵת *the daughter of whom (art) thou?* 1 Sam. 12: 3 מִן קַבְלִית *from the hand of whom* etc.

## § 43.

*Expression of the Pronominal Forms which are wanting in Chaldee.*

1. The *reflexive* pronoun *self, selves*, as already stated (§ 10. 5), is contained in the passive conjugations ; comp. Jon. 3: 6 אֶתְכַסִּי שִׁקָּא *he covered himself with sackcloth*, 2 Sam. 16: 6 אֶתְהַמַּרִּי *take heed to thyself*, Judg. 13: 4 ; — but it is usually expressed by the *suffix* of the third person, e. g. Gen. 22: 3 עָלִימוּחֵי רַת - הָרִין *he took with himself*, 1 Kings 18: 23 רִבְּהֻרוּ לְהֹן חוּרָא *they may choose for themselves (sibi)*, Esth. 6: 1 אֲמַר לְאַרְחָא קְדַמוּחֵי *he commanded to bring before himself*, Judges 20: 40 בְּתִרְיָהוֹן בְּנִרְמִין *behind themselves*, Exod. 5: 29. Sometimes terms are employed, which describe the reflexive pronoun in a periphrastic way ; as, Gen. 18: 12 שָׂרָה בִמְצָהָ *laughed with herself*. This takes place particularly when the pronoun which is made *reflexive*, is the first and second person, e. g. Deut. 4: 9 נִשְׁמְרִי *custodi ani-*

*mam tuam (te)*; Jer. 37: 9 נִפְשִׁי וְנִפְשֵׁיכֶם לֹא חָטְעוּן נִפְשֵׁיכֶם לֹא חָטְעוּן ; Isa. 26: 9 נִפְשִׁי אֶת קִרְסִי דִּי אֲנָא יָהֵב בֵּין- מִימְרֵי וּבִינְךָ *I desire, I long*. Comp. Dan. 1: 15.

Those passages do not properly belong here, in which מִימְרֵי is applied to God in a reciprocal sense; as, Gen. 17: 2. Jon. אֲתֹן קִרְמִי בֵּין אֶת קִרְסִי דִּי אֲנָא יָהֵב בֵּין- מִימְרֵי וּבִינְךָ *between me and thee*, Gen. 9: 12. Onk. מִימְרֵי וּבִינְךָ, Exod. 31: 13. Lev. 26: 46. On the expression *word of God* as equivalent to *God*, in the Targums, see Paulus, Comment. über das N. T. IV. 1. p. 8 sq. Winer, Dissert. de Onkoloso p. 44 sq. comp. also de Jonathanis paraphrasi Chald. Spec. 1. (Erlang. 1823. 4.) p. 25 sq.

2. The pronoun *he that*, is regularly omitted before the relative (§ 41. 3); sometimes it is denoted by בֵּין, e. g. Dan. 3: 6 מִן- דִּי רִי- הֵיִלָּא *he who does not fall down*, 4: 14. Exod. 32: 33 מִן דִּי חָב *he who sins*; yet the latter corresponds more to the general, indefinite expression *ὅς ἄν, quisquis*.

3. *Every, each* is expressed: a) When it stands substantively, by גָּבֵר, e. g. Joel 2: 8. Exod. 15: 3. Isa. 53: 6. Jon. 3: 8. 1 Sam. 25: 13, or אֲנָשׁ Judg. 9: 55, also repeated Exod. 36: 4, אֲתֹן- גָּבֵר, אֲתֹן- גָּבֵר *they came—every one (man by man) from his business*; b) When used adjectively, by a repetition of the substantive, e. g. עַמָּא עַמָּא *every nation*, 2 Kings 17: 29. Esth. 1: 22, or by כָּל- מַדָּה, כָּל- מַדָּה *Quicunque, quodcunque* is מִן כָּל- מַדָּה, Joel 2: 14. Gen. 3: 19. Jon.

4. *Some one, any one*, is אֲנָשׁ Lev. 1: 2. 4: 2. 5: 1. *Something, anything*, is expressed by הִתְחַבֵּסָא (Hebr. דָּבָר) Gen. 18: 14 הִתְחַבֵּסָא מִן- כָּדָם יִּפְתָּח *can anything be concealed from God?* So also adjectively of a person, *some one, any one*, with a preceding *stat. constr. of a nom. abstr.* עֲבִירָה פְּהִיגָם Deut. 24: 1. — In expressing distribution, the idea *somewhat, something*, is contained in the partitive preposition מִן, e. g. Dan. 2: 33 מִן דִּי פְּרוֹזֶל *his feet—from them (was somewhat, a part) of iron*.—*No one*, where it stands opposed to the idea of *every*, is denoted, as in Hebrew, by כָּל- לֹא or כָּל- לֹא, e. g. Gen. 3: 1 לֹא הִיכְלוֹן מִכָּל אֵילָן, Exod. 12: 16 לֹא תֹכְלוּ מִכָּל- עֲבִירָה (the not eating is intended to apply to every fat thing, i. e. *no fat, no sort of fat shall ye eat*); but, besides, it is expressed as in Latin, by the simple לֹא

Gen. 15: 3 לֹא יָחַבְתָּ יֵלֶךְ לִי *to me thou hast given no child*, Deut. 15: 3. *Nothing*, as substantive, is denoted by לֹא--מֵדַע, e. g. Gen. 39: 6 לֹא יָדַע עֲמָה מֵדַע, Deut. 8: 9 or מֵיָדִי לֹא-- Job 6: 6; לֹא--חַד signifies number (*also, even*) *not one*, 2 Sam. 13: 30 לֹא אִשְׁתָּאֵר מִן־הוֹן חַד *no single one is left*.

5. *The one, the other, alter, alter* is denoted; a) By a repetition of the *Pron. demonstr.*; e. g. Isa. 6: 3 מִן־יָיִן מִן־יָיִן *one called to the other*, Dan. 5: 6 אֶרְבָּבְתָּהּ דָּא לָדָא נִקְשָׁן *his knees smote one against the other*, or of the numeral חַד Exod. 17: 12. 1 Sam. 14: 40; — b) By גַּבַּר with אַח, e. g. Gen. 13: 11 מִלְּנֹת אַחֻדֵּי *they separated one from the other*, Deut. 1: 16, or חֵבֵר with גַּבַּר, e. g. Judg. 6: 29, the latter even of inanimate objects, Ezek. 37: 7 קָרִיבוּ גְרִמָּא גְרִמָּא לְנֹת חֲבֵרִיהָ *the bones approached, one to the other*, Dan. 7: 20, also חַד with חֵבֵר Esth. 1: 17 בְּמַלְיוֹתָיו חַד חֵבֵר *one to the other*.

6. *The same, or that very*, is expressed; a) By the *Pronom. person. or demonstr.* with the Hebr. article, e. g. Lev. 20: 4 גִּבְרָא הַהוּא, see above. — b) By the pronoun, placed before the substantive, Dan. 3: 6, 15 בְּהַ שְׁעָתָא *in the same moment* (Gen. 22: 10. T. H. בְּהַ שְׁעָתָא), Dan. 3: 7, 8 בְּהַ זְמָנָא *at the same time*, for which, Cant. 1: 13 בִּי הִיא זְמָנָא. So frequently in Syriac, see Hoffmann, p. 330.

## CHAPTER II.

### Syntax of the Verb.

#### § 44.

#### *Use of the two leading Tenses.*

1. The existing Tense-forms are employed in Chaldee with far less variety of signification, than in Hebrew. The *Præter* denotes the past in all its relations, and is, therefore, also the usual *historical tense*; since the Chaldeans have no *Vav conversive*, e. g. Gen. 9: 1 וַיִּבְרָךְ יְיָ יְהִי נַח, instead of the Hebr. וַיְבָרֶכֶּה. In subordinate clauses, it is used as Pluperfect, e. g. Gen. 2: 2 מִכָּל



עָבַדְתִּיהָ דִּי עָבַד *quod fecerat*, Jon. 1: 10; and in indirect or hypothetical discourse, it is to be taken as this tense with its modifications in the Subjunctive; e. g. Num. 14: 2 לֹא דָמִיתָנָא *would that we had died*, Isa. 11: 9 אֲשֶׁתִּי־צָנָא *that we had perished as the inhabitants of Gomorrah*, Judg. 14: 18 אֶלּוּלָפוֹן בְּדַקְחוֹן בְּאַתְרִי *if ye had not searched it out, ye would not have found it*, Job 3: 13. Gen. 20: 16. 31: 27. Jon. Esth. 7: 4.

2. The Present is denoted by the form of the Praeter, especially in verbs which express an *existence* or a *condition*, or an *act* which is not limited to a definite time; e. g. Ps. 10: 3 אֲשַׁחֲבֶה רְשִׁיעָא *see further* 14: 2 וְהָ מְשִׁמָּא אוֹדִיק עַל בְּנֵי נָשָׂא *עַל הָרֹגֹג נִפְשָׁה* § 74.

The *Praet. propheticum* is not used in Chaldee; the Targums have employed always the *Future*, e. g. Exod. 17: 4. Isa. 1: 31; and where in Hebrew, the Praeter expresses the Imperative according to the demands of the context, they choose regularly the Future, e. g. Gen. 6: 21. 27: 44. 33: 10.

3. The *Future* expresses usually and far more constantly than in Hebrew the *future time*; but it is employed also to denote kindred relations of tense and mode, namely; a) The Optative, e. g. 1 Kings 17: 21 נִפְשָׂא הָרֶבְעָא *oh—that it might return*, Job 3: 3 יוֹכָא יִהְיֶה *pereat dies*; — b) The Imperative, sometimes after another Imperative, Gen. 27: 4. Esth. 6: 5, sometimes and principally in warnings and prohibitions, Exod. 20: 13 לֹא תִקְשֹׁל נֶפֶשׁ, Joel 2: 17 אַל תֵּהֵן *ne des*, Jon. 3: 7. Gen. 46: 3 לֹא תִדְחַל. Hence the command which the Imperative expresses, occasionally connects itself with a prohibitory Future, Ruth 1: 20 — לֹא תִהְיֶה קָרוֹן קָרוֹ לִי etc. — c) The idea *ought, should, can, may*, e. g. Gen. 2: 16 תִּיכּוּל *thou mayest, canst eat*, Gen. 3: 2 נִיכּוּל נִנְחָא *we may eat*, Judg. 14: 16 אַחֲרִי לִי *how should I show it to thee?* Jon. 4: 11 אֵינִי עַל נִינְוָה *should I not spare Nineveh?*

On the contrary, the Future wherever it denotes the past in Hebrew, is constantly exchanged in the Targums for the Praeter or Participle, comp. Isa. 10: 12. 1 Kings 3: 16. Gen. 2: 6, etc. They have also employed the Participle (in questions) for the Future in the sense

of the Present, Job 1: 7. Gen. 3: 15. Judg. 15: 9. Jon. 1: 8 [Does the *Praeter* occur Josh. 9: 8 in the sense—*whence are ye come?*]

4. Further, within the scope of the Future falls also the expression of that which is hypothetical; Job 10: 18 *wherefore hast thou brought me forth from the womb?* אֶתְּנֶנִּי וְעֵינִי לֹא הָסְכֵנִי *I should have died and no eye had*, etc., as well as that which is merely intentional or designed; hence the Future stands regularly after the particles *that, in order that*, e. g. Gen. 11: 7 דָּלָא יִשְׁמְעוּן *that they may not hear*, Lev. 10: 7 דְּלֹמָא תָּמוּתוּן *that ye may not die*, Ezek. 20: 26. Dan. 2: 16, 23. So frequently after וְ *that*, e. g. Exod. 5: 1 שִׁלַּח וְיִרְחֻגוּן *send away my people and they shall observe a feast*, i. e. *that they may observe*, Exod. 2: 7. Jon. Judg. 14: 15. Gen. 27: 4. Jon. 1: 11.

### § 45.

#### *Modes of expressing certain Finite Tenses.*

1. In the later Targums, the *Praeter* of a verb stands sometimes connected with the *Praeter* of the substantive verb in the same person, particularly in subordinate (relative) clauses, and is then to be taken as Pluperfect or Imperfect, e. g. Gen. 4: 1. Jon. אֵת-הוּא דְּחָוָא תְּחִידָה לְמִלְאָכָא יָדַע *who desired (had desired)*, Cant. 1: 12 דְּמִקְדַּמָּה דְּנָה תָּוָא נָפֶס רִיחִיהוּן *had gone out*, etc.

2. The *Future* is sometimes described by עָתִיד (ready) prefixed to an *Infin.* with לְ or a *finite verb* with דְּ, e. g. Nah. 1: 2 עָתִיד יְיָ לְאַתְפֹּרֵעַ *Jehovah will punish*, puniturus est, Gen. 3: 15. Jon. עָתִידִין אֵינוּן לְמַעַבְדַּד (also v. 20). Joel 1: 15. 2: 31. Gen. 21: 7 עָתִידָה אֵיתִיכוּן עָתִידִין דִּי תִשְׁמְעוּן *paritura est filios*, Dan. 3: 15 תִּשְׁמְעוּן דִּי תִשְׁמְעוּן *auditura estis*. Similar to this is the construction of הוּא, followed by an *Inf.* with לְ, except only that by means of the inflection of this verb all the forms of the Latin Fut. may be periphrastically expressed, e. g. Gen. 15: 12 הוּא שָׁמָּה לְיָמָעַל *the sun was on the point of going down*, i. e. *would go down*. In both constructions, the *Infin. act.* is sometimes to be taken passively, e. g. Dent. 31: 17 וְהוּן לְמִיכַל *they shall be consumed*, Eccl. 11: 7 אֲבִי לְאַנְהָרָא אֲבִי *they shall be enlightened (they stand ready to be, etc.)*.

Both expressions are in a certain measure united, Deut. 32: 29. Jon. מֶה יְהִי עֲתִיד לָמֹ, where it could be written either מֶה יְהִי עֲתִיד לָמֹ or מֶה יְהִי לָמֹ.

## § 46.

### *Use of the Imperative and Infinitive.*

1. When two Imperatives are connected by ו, the second in animated or sententious discourse sometimes declares a consequence of the first, and hence is essentially a Future, as in the well known phrase "divide et impera," e. g. Isa. 45: 22 אֶהְיֶה לְמִיָּרִי וְאַהְפָּרִיקוּ *turn to me and be ye happy, for — and ye shall be happy*, 8: 9 (comp. Grammat. N. T. 288).

2. The *Infin.* united with prepositions (especially בְּ or כִּ), must often be resolved, particularly in historical discourse, into the finite verb and a conjunction; yet this construction occurs more rarely than in Hebrew, and the writers of the Targums have generally changed such Hebr. *Infinitives* into the finite verb with כִּ as, חֲלָהְךָ *that*, etc., according to the requirement of the context, e. g. Gen. 2: 4. 12: 14. 39: 18. Exod. 16: 7. Deut. 7: 8. Isa. 60: 15. Yet comp. Gen. 33: 18 בְּמִיתוּדֵי מִשְׁפַּח אָרָם *at his coming*, i. e. *as he came*, 44: 30 כְּמִיתִי *when I come to thy servant*, Exod. 11: 1 כִּשְׁלַחְתָּהּ *when he shall release* (here in Hebr. stands the finite verb) Isa. 29: 23, Judg. 6: 18 עַד מִיָּתְאִי *until I come*, Joel 3: 19 בְּגִלְגָּל וּבְחֶרֶב *on account of the oppression, because they oppressed*, and negatively Gen. 27: 1 כִּי לֹא רָאָה *that he could not see*, Gen. 11: 8 כִּי לֹא בָנִי *that they could not build*, 38: 9. The *Infin.* has also sometimes, in such cases, an object in the accusative, בְּמִלְכֵּי רִינִי וּבְחֶרֶב Ps. 119: 7. Isa. 29: 23 כִּי יִבְרֹךְ *when he beholds the glory*.

3. When the *Infin.* depends on a preceding verb which expresses *design, command, or ability*, or upon a noun, it is generally to be connected with the same (and indeed oftener than in Hebr.) by לְ (to), e. g. Exod. 2: 15 בָּעָא לְמַקְטֹל *he sought to kill*, 1 Kings 3: 7 לֹא יָצֵאתִי *I cannot go out*, etc., Gen. 41: 1. Jon. אֶחָדָם *they conspired to throw*, Dan. 3: 20 אֶמַר לְכַסְתָּהּ *he commanded to bind*, Gen. 29: 7 לֹא עֵידָן לְמִכְנֹשׁ *it is not time to collect*, Esth. 6:



1. 2: 9. Yet this לְ is also omitted, especially when the *Infin.* depends on nouns, e. g. Josh. 10: 27 עָרֵן מִיַּעַל שְׁמֵשׁא.

When the *Infin.* with לְ follows אִירָה, אָל, or לִירָה, מֵה, it is to be translated—it is permitted, is not permitted, it may, may not, etc. Dan. 6: 9 לֹחֲשָׁנָה לֹא כְתֻבָּא דִּי לֹא לְחֻשְׁנָה a writing which may not be changed, Gen. 4: 8. T. H. לֹא לְמִתֵּן אֶגֶר טָב, Jer. 7: 8. Eccl. 4: 1. comp. Ewald, 622.

4. The *Infin.* is often placed with its finite verb, in order to render the verbal idea in some way more intensive, e. g. Gen. 2: 17. 3: 4 מִיָּמָה תִּמּוּת moriendo morieris, thou shalt surely, inevitably die, Gen. 26: 11 אֲתֻקָּלָא אֲתֻקָּלָא Gen. 2: 16 תֵּיכֹל מִיכָל thou mayest freely eat, Gen. 43: 3 אֶסְהַדָּא אֶסְהַדָּא בְּנָא he has earnestly, solemnly declared, 1 Sam. 20: 6 אֶשְׁתַּאֲלָא אֶשְׁתַּאֲלָא he earnestly asked, Gen. 43: 7 אֲזָלִין מִיֻּזַּל הֲוִינָא יָדְעִין הֲמֵדַע could we then know, 1 Sam. 6: 12 אֲזָלִין מִיֻּזַּל they went straight onward. Comp. Exod. 5: 23. 18: 18. Joel 1: 7. Gen. 40: 15. Deut. 3: 26. Esth. 6: 13. Judg. 15: 2.

A special form for this *Infin. absol.* has not been developed in the Chaldee. A tendency to it is observable Gen. 49: 6 קָטְלוּ קָטֹל, Ps. 40: 2 מְסַבְּרָא סְבִירָה, Ps. 132: 15 מְבָרְכָא אֲבָרְךָ and in verbs: לֹא מְחַדָּא מְחַדָּא Isa. 61: 20, מְחַזָּא חֲזִינָא Gen. 26: 28, מְלַאָּה תִלְאָי Exod. 18: 18. Yet these forms are by no means constantly employed for the *Infin. absol.*

Where the *Infin.* stood or seemed to stand directly for the finite verb in Hebr., the writers of the Targums have always changed it into the proper tense, e. g. Ezek. 1: 14. Jer. 14: 5. 2 Sam. 3: 18, etc.

5. The personal suffix attached to the *Infin.* is not always to be understood of the subject of the action; as, Gen. 33: 18 בְּמִיתְהִי on my coming, i. e. as I came, 2 Kings 2: 42 בְּיוֹם מִצְקָךְ on the day of thy going out, i. e. when thou goest out, (see above No. 2), but also of the object, and in the last case is to be resolved consequently by the *Accus.*, as Dan. 6: 20 לְשִׁירֻבוֹתְךָ to deliver thee.

## § 47.

### Use of the Participle.

1. The use of the Participle, a) with the substantive verb, for the purpose of representing the *finite tenses*, is in Chaldee

(Syr. and Talm.) far more frequent than in Hebrew, and is employed principally in those cases in which a continued action is to be described, e. g. Exod. 15: 14 הָיוּ יֹהָבִין *they inhabit*, 1 Sam. 25: 15 בְּדֹ הָיוּ אָנָּה שָׁרָן *where we dwelt*, Dan. 2: 31 הָיָה הַחֹהֵן *thou sawest*, Joel 3: 18 יֵהִי נַפֶּק וּמַשְׁקֵי יֵהִי *it shall go forth and water*, Esth. 6: 1 הָיוּ מִהֶקְרִין *they were read*, Dan. 7: 2 הָיוּ הַחִירִין *Eccl.* 5: 6. Zach. 10: 9 דְּכִירִין הָיוּ *they remember*, 'Ruth 1: 20 לֹא קָרָאן *ye shall not call*, Hos. 7: 13; b) With the personal pronoun or with אִיתָ (= יִישׁ) and לִיתָ, the Participle serves likewise to supply the place of the finite tenses, commonly of the Present, more rarely and only where the reference of the context to the past and future is clear, that of the Praeter and Future, Gen. 32: 11 אֲנִי דְחִיל *I fear*, Joel 1: 19 אֲנִי מִצְלִי *I pray*, Jon. 1: 12 אֲנִי יָדַע *I know*, Gen. 23: 29 אָתָּה שָׁאַל לְשִׁמִּי *thou askest after my name*, Gen. 19: 13 מִחֲבָלִין אֲנַחֵן *we will destroy*, 15: 14 דָּאֵן אֲנִי *I will judge*, Hos. 7: 13. Hag. 1: 9. Eccl. 4: 16. Deut. 32: 52. Judg. 14: 3. In sentences which contain a wish or exclamation, this construction is also sometimes to be explained as optative, Ruth 3: 10 בְּרִיכָה אַתָּה *blessed (be) thou*, 1 Sam. 25: 32. With אִיתָ and לִיתָ, see Judg. 6: 36 אִיתָ אֲנִי דְכִיל *if thou wilt deliver*, Isa. 36: 5 לִיתָ אֲנִי דְכִיל *I am not able*, Jon. 2: 9 לִיתָ אֲנִי דְכִיל, Deut. 4: 22. Gen. 42: 13. Jon.

The Participle seldom stands alone for the finite verb, e. g. Job 1: 13 בְּנוֹי אֲכָלִין וְשָׂחִין, Dan. 2: 5, 7, 38.

2. If the Participles govern a noun, they are, a) either treated as nouns, i. e. they stand in the *stat. constr.*, or the accompanying noun has הַ Genit., e. g. Joel 1: 5 שְׂתֵי הַחֵמֶר *the wine-drinkers*, 1: 2 אֲכָלֵי הָאֲרָץ *inhabitants of the land*, 1 Kings 2: 7 אֲכָלֵי פִתּוֹךְ *who eat at thy table*, 1 Kings 18: 19. Gen. 34: 24. Jon. 1: 2 כָּל נִפְקֵי הַרֶעַךְ *all that go through the gate*, Deut. 32: 24 אֲכָלֵי טוֹף *devoured by birds*, Ps. 24: 4 אֲרִי־יָדַי *pure of hands*; on the contrary, Gen. 22: 12 דְּחִיל *fearing God*, Gen. 49: 26 מִפְּרִישָׁא רְאָחוֹהֵי *separated from his brethren*; — b) Or they are treated as parts of the verb and take the noun as direct object in the *Accus.*, e. g. Exod. 25: 20 פְּרִישָׁן *spreading out their wings*, Isa. 53: 2 לָהּ אֲרִי־כָּהּ *desiring him*, 1 Kings 22: 10 לְבִישָׁן לְבוּשָׁן *clothed in robes*, comp. § 50. 2.

3. The Participle, where it occurs as adjunctive, expresses regularly the Present, or in narration the Praeter; the latter, e. g. Gen. 19: 14 בְּנִחִיהָ נָסְבִי *who took his daughters*. Where in Hebrew, on the contrary, the Participle stands for the Future in a sentence which refers to future time, the writers of the Targums have generally resolved it into עָתִיד, e. g. Exod. 11: 5. Ps. 22: 32.

## § 48.

*The Optative.*

For the expression of a *desire* or *wish*, the Future is employed in Chaldee (§ 44. 3), especially in the following applications: a) In the form of a question, Judg. 9: 29 עָמָא רִחַ יִמְסֵר מִן *would that this people were committed to me*, 2 Sam. 15: 4 מִן יִמְנְנִי דִּיקָא *would that I were appointed judge*. Deserving of special remark is the use of מִן יִהֵן, an imitation of the Hebrew, in expressions like Deut. 28: 67 מִן יִהֵן צִפְרָא *would it were evening*. — b) With לְיִי preceding, e. g. Gen. 17: 18 לְיִי יִחְיֶה קַדְמָךְ *would that he might live before thee*. If the wish has respect to the past, the Praeter is naturally employed; as, Num. 20: 3 לְיִי דִּמְתָּנָא *would we had died*.

## § 49.

*Number and Person of the Verb.*

1. In the use of the Persons of the verb with reference to their subject, irregularities sometimes occur: a) In respect to the *gender*, Exod. 12: 16 לֹא יִתְעַבֵּיר לָא *do not be angry*, Ruth 1: 8 דִּי עֲבָדְתוֹן חַל *for I have served*, Esth. 1: 20 יִתְנִיחַ לָא *do not let*, Jer. 7: 20 חֲמַתִּי חַל *my wrath is kindled*, Exod. 2: 18. Jon. אֲחִיחִתִּי *my fellow-countryman*. (Comp. אֲתָאָה at the beginning of the verse). b) In respect to the *number*: α) Collective nouns often have their verb in the *Plur.*, Jer. 28: 4 גִּלְיָה יִהְיֶה *shall be*, Gen. 33: 13 עָנָא *shall answer*, Gen. 35: 11 סָגִי עִם וְכַנְשָׁה *shall be with thee*, Isa. 52: 14. 53: 8. 1 Sam. 14: 41, 45. Num. 10: 3, or a verb in the *Plur.* refers to a preceding collective noun, Exod. 5: 1 שְׁלַח יְתֵ-עַמִּי וְיִתְחַוֶּה *release my people and they shall*, etc., 2 Chron.



25: 15. β) The verb when placed first, may be in the Sing., while its subject follows in the Plur.; e. g. 1 Sam. 1: 2 וְהָיָא לִפְנֵיהֶם בְּנִין, Isa. 1: 7. Joel 1: 13 אֶתְּמַנֵּה קִירְבָּנִין וְנִסְבִּין. In this case either the subject was not yet distinctly present to the mind of the writer, or was viewed as a unity, as a complete whole. See below § 6.

Gen. 4: 26. Jon. is not to be considered as a case of *enallage* in the gender—to Seth was born a son, וַיִּקְרָת יֵת - שֵׁמֶה אָנוּשׁ and she called him (i. e. the mother called him, who in other instances also gives the name). So perhaps Deut. 14: 7. Some of these discrepancies are probably errors in writing or printing; as, Lev. 8: 15, נָסִיבֻּם for נָסִיבוּ.

2. The third pers. *Sing.* is often used impersonally in both genders, 1 Sam. 30: 6 עָקַת לְדָוִד *David was afraid*, Gen. 21: 31 לִי הָיָה לְסֵהֲרֹה *it serves for a witness*.

3. The indefinite *one, they*, is expressed in Chaldee; a) By the third pers. *Sing.*, Gen. 11: 9 קָרָא שְׁמָהּ *they called the name of it*, 48: 1 אָמַר לְיוֹסֵף *one told, it was told to Joseph*. b) By the third person plural, Isa. 47: 1 יִקְרֹון דְּתִיבִין לָא *they shall no longer call thee*, Isa. 52: 15. Joel 2: 17; so likewise with plural Particip. Dan. 3: 4 לְכוּן אֲמַרִין.—This construction (especially the latter phraseology) is very frequent in Chaldee and must be rendered directly by the Passive, e. g. Dan. 2: 30 הוֹדְעִין יֵת פִּשְׁרָא לְמַלְכָּא *that the interpretation be made known*, 4: 13 יִשְׁנוֹן לְבָבָה *his heart shall be changed*; c) By the second person *Sing.*, Isa. 41: 12.

4. In Chaldee far more frequently than in Hebrew (Ewald, p. 596 sq., Winer's *Simonis Lexic.* p. 103), a noun is put with Passives in the Accusative, which we should expect rather as subject in the Nominative, e. g. Gen. 21: 8 וַיִּצְחַק יֵת - אֶתְּחַסִּיל *Isaac was weaned*, 17: 5 אֶבְרָם - שְׁמֶךָ עוֹד יֵת - לָא יִקְרִי *thy name shall no more be called Abram*. It is said in this case that יֵת is sign of the Nominative (*nota nominativi*); but probably the writers originally regarded the preceding verb as impersonal: *one, they weaned Isaac*, (comp. *ablactandum fuit filiam*), *let not one any more call thy name*, etc. By degrees, however, the original sense of the construction was forgotten, and it was applied in practice indiscriminately to cases, where its subject preceded or followed the Passive. Additional examples are found: Exod. 3: 7 גִּלְיָה קָדְמִי יֵת - שְׂרַעְבּוֹד עָמִי,

Gen. 31: 42. Jon. יֵת - סִיגוּפִי גָלִי קָדָם יֵת, 21: 5 יֵת - וְצָחַק 5, Exod. 10: 8. Jon. פָּקִיד לְאַתְחָבָא יֵת - מִשָּׁה Gen. 34: 5. Onk., Josh. 9: 24 יֵת - חָנָא אֶתְחָנָא לְעִבְדָּהּ יֵת דְּפָקֵד יֵת, Deut. 1: 34. So also with neuter verbs, Exod. 6: 5. Jon. יֵת אֲנִיָּק בְּנִי, Deut. 30: 1. Jon. בְּדִי יֵתוֹן עֲלֵיכֹן יֵת כָּל פְּתָגְמִיא.

5. The plural of the first person stands sometimes as *pluralis majesticus* in cases where a king or important personage is introduced as speaking, e. g. Ezra 7: 24 לָכֵם מְהוּדְעִין יֵת *we make known to you*, Dan. 2: 36 פְּשִׁיחָה נֵאמַר, comp. Ezra 4: 18.

6. In connection with *several* subjects, the verb stands sometimes in the singular, e. g. Exod. 21: 4 אֶתְחָא וּבְנָהָא תְּהִי, Esth. 7: 1 עֵאל מְלָכָא וְהָמֵן, sometimes and more frequently in the plural Ps. 85: 11. Gen. 41: 1. Jon. The singular is used particularly when the nouns which form the subject, stand after the verb, Gen. 8: 16. Num. 20: 11. 1 Sam. 14: 41, or when if the verb follows, a special prominence is designed to be given to some one of the subjects over the others, as Exod. 21: 4.

## § 50.

### *Construction of Verbs with Dative and Accusative.*

1. The external distinction between the Dative and Accusative is not so clearly defined in Chaldee as in Hebrew; since even the latter case is sometimes denoted by ל *præfixum*, e. g. Dan. 2: 24 sq. 5: 4. Gen. 40: 1. Jon. Taking as a guide, however, those passages where the Accusative is denoted by יֵת and the analogy also of Hebrew usage, we may lay it down as a general rule, that the following verbs, which are intransitive in Latin and German syntax,\* are treated in Chaldee as transitive, and accordingly take their object in the Accusative: 1) An Accusative of the person, יֵת to answer Judg. 8: 8, אֶתְיָבֵי יֵתָה *they answered him* 1 Sam. 25: 10, יֵתָה *to meet (accidere), befall*, Gen. 42: 29 יֵתָה *all which had happened to them* 1 Sam. 25: 20. Josh. 2: 23, פָּקֵד *command*,

\* For the most part also in English syntax, though not, as the student will perceive, in all the examples adduced.—Tr.

Gen. 7: 9, כָּמָא דְּפָקִיד ל' ית נח *as Jehovah had commanded Noah*, Deut. 1: 16, 18 sq. חָמִין to trust Judg. 11: 20 וְשָׂרָאֵל ית - *he trusted not Israel*, שָׁמַשׁ to serve Gen. 49: 4. Ezek. 44: 12 etc., בָּסַר to announce 2 Sam. 18: 19 (on the contrary, חוּא is connected with Dat. Pers. — 2) Verbs also which signify *to be satisfied* and *to satisfy*, *to be full* and *to fill*, *to be wanting* and *to fail*, are connected with the Accusative of the object, with, from or on which one is satisfied, filled, etc.; e. g. Eccl. 4: 8 לֹא חָבֹל *to be satisfied*, Jer. 31: 14 אֶשְׂבֵּעַ עִמִּי ית טוֹבִי *I will satisfy my people with my goodness*, Joel 2: 19 תִּשְׂבְּעוּן יתה *ye shall be satisfied therewith*, Job 20: 11 אֶחְמְלִיאת אֶרְעָא חֲטוּפִין *Gen. 6: 13*, Joel 2: 24. Gen. 1: 20 מֵיָא יִרְחֲשׁוּן *the waters shall swarm with*, etc., Jer. 9: 18 וַיִּשְׁגְּרוּן עֵינָנָא דְּמַעֵין *that our eyes overflow with tears*, Lam. 3: 48. Deut. 2: 7 לֹא חָסַרְתָּ מִדָּעַם *thou hast had need of nothing*, Gen. 18: 28 חֲמִשָּׁא זָכָאִין חֲמִשִּׁין *if perhaps there lack five of the fifty righteous*. Yet verbs of *filling* and *satisfying* (*being satisfied*) are also construed with ב (2 Kings 9: 24, etc.); see § 51. 4.

On the Accusative with Passives, see § 49. 4.

2. Some verbs are followed by two Accusatives: a) The Conjugations Paël and Aphel, when they have a causative signification, e. g. 2 Kings 20: 13 אֶחְזִינִין ית כל בֵּית גִּנְזוּהִי *he let them see his treasures*, Job 39: 19 תִּלְבֹּשׁ צִוְרִיהַּ הוּקְפָא *thou clothest his neck with power*, Gen. 37: 23. Jon. אֶשְׁלְחוּ ית - יוֹסֵף ית - פִּרְגוּרִיהַּ *they drew off from Joseph his raiment\**, 1 Sam. 14: 12 נְהוֹרַע רַחֲבֹן פְּהִנְקָא *we will teach it to you*, Gen. 41: 39. Jon. אוֹרַע ית רַחֲבֹן ית כל *Exod. 15: 25*, Exod. 29: 9 תִּזְרִיזוּן יתהוֹן חֲמִינִין *אֶלְפִיָּהּ ית אֶזָּא*, Exod. 36: 34 ית דְּפִיָּא חָפָא דְּהָבָא *to sow*, Lev. 19: 19 תִּזְרִיזוּן יתהוֹן חֲמִינִין *to show, requite* (good or evil, *ποιεῖν τινά τι*) 1 Sam. 24: 18 גְּמַלְחִנִי טְבָחָא *Gen. 30: 29* ית די *to request* (*rogare aliquem aliquid*) and *answer*, Deut. 14: 26 פְּלִחְתָּךְ *to request*, Gen. 30: 29 ית די *to commission*, 2 Sam. 11: 22 יתהוֹן חֲמִינִין *to make one thing into another*, Exod. 30: 25 תִּזְרִיזוּן יתהוֹן חֲמִינִין *or Lev. 24: 5* תִּזְרִיזוּן יתהוֹן חֲמִינִין *bake it to a cake*.

\* But instead of the Accus. of the thing, ב is also sometimes employed in this construction, e. g. Jer. 6: 26 חוּפִין יִשְׁכַּח בְּקִטְמָא.



When in these verbs the construction is applied passively, the Accusative of the thing remains of course unchanged (Gesen. Lehrgeb. 821). 1 Kings 22: 10. The writers of the Targums, however, have generally adopted easier constructions in the place of this, e. g. Mich. 2: 10. The passage adduced here by Gesenius, Isa. 1: 20 תִּרְבּוּ תִּרְבּוּ תִּרְבּוּ stands in the Targums thus: בְּתִרְבּוּ סִנְאָה תִּתְקַטְלוּ.

4. The Dative, in addition to the usual cases, stands, a) after קָרָא *to call*, Gen. 3: 9. Judg. 16: 25 etc., after נָשַׁק *to kiss*, Gen. 27: 26. Exod. 4: 27, after שָׁאַל *consulere*, Job 8: 8; —b) after Passives, in order to denote the cause from which the effect proceeds, e. g. Ezek. 14: 3 אֲשֶׁהָאֵל לְהוֹן *I was asked by them*, Exod. 12: 16.

REM. A noun which depends on a verb, is usually placed after the verb. To this simple construction which characterizes the Semitic languages generally, there are some exceptions, e. g. Dan. 2: 16 דִּנָּה חֲלָמָא חַיִּית אֵנָה וְאַנְתָּה פִּשְׁרָא 4: 15 רַחֲמִין לְמַבְצָא 18 פִּשְׁרָא לְהַחֲזִירָא; 1 Kings 18: 23 אֲשֶׁהָא לֹא יִשְׁוִיוֹן Esth. 1: 19. This inversion takes place sometimes for the sake of contrast, sometimes because the noun is to be made more prominent.

## § 51.

### *Verbs with Prepositions.*

1. With בְּ (*in, on*), are construed verbs, which signify *taking, holding upon* Prov. 4: 13 אֶתְחַזֵּק בְּמַדְרוֹתָא, Num. 11: 17 יִסּוּבְרוּן בְּמַטּוֹל (on the contrary, אָחַד with Acc.pers. *seize as an enemy* [καταειν τινα] 1 Sam. 23: 26. Judg. 7: 25);—*acknowledging or denying*, Gen. 25: 34 כָּפַר בְּהַחַיֵּית מֵתָא (T. H.) *he denied the resurrection of the dead*, Gen. 25: 29. Jon. כָּפַר בְּדַחֲלָא תִּקְרִיפָא Deut. 32: 15. T. H. Jer. 2: 27. Ps. 12: 5. (comp. the expression, which is an imitation of this, ὁμολογεῖν ἐν τινι Gr. N. T. p. 178);—*seeing, hearing, smelling, etc.*, when the accessory idea of earnestness and perseverance is involved, *to witness, to gaze, to smell at, hearken*, e. g. Gen. 21: 16 לֹא אֶחְזִי בְּמוֹתָא דְּרַבְיָא *I cannot witness the death of the lad*, Exod. 30: 38 לְאַרְחָא *to smell thereat*, Deut. 26: 14. Jon. קָבַל בְּשׁוּמְרָא רִי *we listened to the word*, Jon. 1: 14 קָבַל בְּשׁוּמְרָא *hear our prayer*;—*aversion, disgust (towards a person or thing)*, 1 Sam. 25: 14 קָץ בְּהוֹן *invoking (in prayer)*, Gen. 4: 26 לְצִלָּאָה בְּשִׁמָּא רִיָּה;—*ruling over any one*,

Joel 2: 17 בָּהוֹן לְמִשְׁלֵט *in order to rule over them*; — *treating*, Jem. (to do to any one thus or so), Dan. 4: 32 שָׁמַיָּא עָבַד בְּחִיל comp. Gesen. Monum. Phoen. p. 229.

As בְּ of the object, we are to consider also such cases as Gen. 4: 2 אָדָם פָּלַח בְּאֶרֶצָא *he cultivated the land*, and 2 Sam. 23: 10 קָנַל בְּפִלְשְׁתִּיָּא *he slew (among) the Philistines*.

As in Hebrew, so here בְּ is prefixed to a noun denoting the vessel out of which one eats or drinks, e. g. Gen. 44: 5 הָלֵא רֵיחַ רִשְׁתִּי רַבּוּנִי בֵּה *he*, Dan. 5: 2. This mode of speaking is founded on the same conception that appears in English in such phrases as *to eat on silver*, or in Latin *auro bibere*, Seneca Thyest. 453 etc. Gr. N. T. p. 372. Rem.

2. With לְ (eis) are connected verbs which denote *becoming something*, a *making into something*, Jer. 9: 11 לְרִגְרוֹן יִהְיֶה רֵחַ יְרוּשָׁלַם, Exod. 4: 16 לְמַתוּרָגְמֹן לֵהְיֶה לָּהּ, Joel 1: 7 לְצִדּוֹ עֲמִי גּוֹפְגִי עֲמִי, comp. also Gen. 17: 4. 1 Sam. 4: 9. Joel 3: 19. Dan. 4: 27; see Lengerke on the passage (yet comp. § 50. 2); more rarely those which express *being accounted as something*, 1 Kings 10: 21 אֶתְחַשֵּׁיב לָא *he* (λογίζεσθαι eis Rom. 2: 26. 9: 8 etc.).

3. Verbs which denote affections of the mind, are followed by עַל; viz. *compassion*, *anger*, Deut. 28: 50. Joel 2: 17 sq. Jon. 3: 9. 4: 9, 10. Isa. 11: 1 עָלֵי הִרְחַם — *joy and sorrow*, Jon. 4: 6 קִיקִיּוֹן עַל הָרִי, Zeph. 3: 17 רִדּוּץ עָלָהּ, Joel 1: 11 אֶלִּילֹה עַל חֲשִׁין (yet the former are also construed with בְּ, Isa. 25: 9. Gen. 34: 19. Hab. 3: 18); *contempt*, 2 Sam. 6: 16 בְּסִרְחַת עָלֹהִי, 12: 9 — *forbearance*, Joel 2: 18 חָסֵי עַל אֶרְצָה Jon. 4: 11, then, in another application, *covering and protecting*, Num. 16: 33 חָפֵס עָלֵיהוֹן אֶרְצָא, Ezek. 37: 6. 2 Kings 20: 6 אָגִין עַל קֶרְחָא (hence also עַל כַּפֵּר in the sense *to expiate*, Exod. 29: 36. Lev. 1: 4. 4: 20, etc.); — *pressing upon*, i. e. *being burdensome*, 2 Sam. 13: 25 עָלָה נְהָקָה עָלָהּ; — *charging, transferring*, as, 2 Chron. 36: 23 עָלֵי לְבָנֵי פָקִיד *he charged me to build*.

4. With מִן are construed verbs; a) Which denote *fearing*, *taking care*, *fleeing*, *abstaining (before, from something)* Ps. 40: 12 לָא חֲמִנֵעַ מִן, Deut. 1: 21 מִן הָהָרִים מִן הַיָּם, Ps. 119: 64. — b) Frequently verbs, which signify *being full*, *filling*, *wanting (in, with something)* Prov. 1: 31 מִן הַמַּלְכִּיּוֹן יִסְבְּעוֹן, Eccl. 4: 8 מִן הַיָּבֹוֹתָא. The מִן in this case refers to the mass, from which or out of which (partatively) something is filled (yet comp. § 50. 1); — c) The

verb קָבַל in the sense *to hearken, to obey*, Gen. 21: 12 קָבַל מִנָּה *hearken to her*, 37: 27 etc. (properly to receive from any one the direction which he gives us); on the contrary, the command, the order which one obeys, is expressed in the Dative, Gen. 3: 17 קָבַלְתָּא לְמִימַר אֶתְחָדָה, 16: 2. Deut. 11: 13.

5. With בָּתַר are connected verbs which signify *to follow (to pursue, to persecute)*, Gen. 44: 4 גָּבְרִיָא בָּתַר יִרְדָּה.

## § 52.

*Use of Verbs in the Place of Adverbs.*

Two verbs are often connected together in such a manner, that one of them must be taken as equivalent to an adverb. Here belong particularly the words אוֹסִיף *to add, for again, further*, אוֹטִיב *to make good, for good, excellently*, קָדָם *to come before, to anticipate, for first, before*, הוּב *to return, for again*, אוֹחֵר *to hasten, for quickly*, אֶסְגִּי *to multiply, for much*, e. g. Gen. 4: 12 הוֹסִיף לְמַהֵן חַיִּלָּה Gen. 8: 10. Gen. 3: 24. Jon. אוֹסִיפַת לְמִיִּלְדָּה Jon. 2: 5. יוֹנָה יָת יוֹנָה אוֹסִיף שָׁלַח יָת יוֹנָה Ps. 33: 3. אוֹטִיבוּ לְשִׁבְתָּא Gen. 49: 8. וַיְהוֹן מְקַדְמִין לְמִשְׁאֵל Gen. 26: 18 אוֹחֵר יָת יוֹנָה חֵב יָת יוֹנָה comp. Jer. 36: 15, 28. מְגַלְתָּא אוֹחֵרִי take to thee again, etc. 2 Chron. 17: 6. Gen. 22: 9. Jon. Gen. 27: 20 אוֹחֵרִי חֵב יָת יוֹנָה why come ye so early, Exod. 2: 18. Jon. אוֹחֵרִי חֵב יָת יוֹנָה Esth. 6: 10 לְבִישׁ יָת יוֹנָה thou hast acted foolishly, Joel 2: 20 אֶסְגִּי לְמַעַבְדָּה בִּישׁוֹן he has done much evil (evil in abundance).

## § 53.

*Constructio praegnans, Brachylogy and Ellipsis of the Verb.*

1. A noun is sometimes connected with a verb by a preposition, which must be referred in the mind of the reader to some other verbal idea, that has been omitted (*constructio praegnans*), e. g. Num. 14: 24 בָּתַר דְּחִלְתִּי אֶשְׁלִים *perfecte sectatus est reverentiam mei* Isa. 21: 9 כָּל-צִלְמֵי טַעֲוִתָהּא יִדְקָדְקוּן לְאַרְצָא *to the earth were they (thrown and) dashed in pieces*, Dan. 4: 13 לְבָבָה מִן-אַנְשָׁא וְשִׁנּוֹן (see



Lengerke on the passage), Deut. 1: 16. In a different manner, two sentences may be brachyologically combined in one, 1 Sam. 10: 9 *וַיִּשְׁנֵי יְיָ לִבָּא אֲחֵרָא* *Jehovah changed to him another heart*, i. e. changed him and gave to him, etc.

2. Sometimes the verb of the sentence is entirely omitted, and must then be supplied from the parts of the predicate, which are expressed, e. g. 1 Kings 22: 36 *גָּבַר לְקִרְיָתוֹ וּגְבַר לְאֶרְצָהּ* *every one* (betook himself) *to his city, every one to his country*.

### CHAPTER III.

#### Syntax of the Noun.

##### § 54.

#### *Use of Nouns for Adjectives, and Expression of Concrete Substantives.*

1. The Chaldee language has comparatively but few adjectives; and instead of employing them, it was more in consonance with the oriental style of thought to make use of nouns for this purpose. Nouns when so employed follow the *nomens regens* in the Genitive, e. g. Dan. 3: 5 *צִלָּם דְּהָבָא* *image of gold*, i. e. *golden image*, Ps. 2: 9 *חֹטְבָא דְּפַרְזָלָא* *iron rod*, Gen. 3: 14. Jon. *אֲרִיסָא דְּמוֹתָא* *deadly poison* (comp. 40: 1), Gen. 3: 21. Onk. *לְבוּשֵׁין דִּיקָר* *costly garments*, (Exod. 29: 29) Gen. 17: 8 *אַחֲסִנָּת עָלַם* *eternal possession*.

When the word that expresses the adjective quality stands as the *nomen regens*, it has the effect of giving a special prominence to this idea, e. g. Exod. 13: 3 *בְּחִקְוָה יַד* *with strength of hand*, Lev. 7: 21 *טֻמְאַת אִנְשָׂא* *uncleanness of a man* (in the sequel, *בְּעִירָא מְסֻאָבָא*). So *every one* (*all*) is constantly expressed by *כל* (*universitas*).

2. Concrete, particularly personal qualities, whether they are denoted by adjectives or substantives, are described by certain concrete substantives, viz. by *בְּעַל*, *גָּבַר*, *מְרִי*, *בִּר*, e. g. Exod. 4: 10 *גָּבַר דְּמִלּוּל* *man of discourse*, i. e. *eloquent*, Gen. 37: 19 *מְרִי תַלְמִיזָא* *dreamers*, 2 Kings 1: 8 *בְּעַל סַעְרָן* *hairy*, Gen. 29: 1 *בְּנֵי מִדְּנָהָא* *in-*

*habitants of the east*, Exod. 12: 5 בַּר שָׁמָא *one year old*. Specially frequent is בֶּעַל דָּבָא *foe, hostile*, Exod. 15: 9.

## § 55.

*Numbers, and the Repetition of Nouns.*

1. The plural is sometimes used in an indefinite manner, when, in strict propriety of speech, the thought should have been expressed in the singular, e. g. Judg. 12: 7 אֶתְקַבֵּר בְּקִירוֹי גִלְעָד *he was buried in the cities (in one of the cities) of Gilead*, (as in Liv. 1. 4. in silvis natus); on the contrary, Gen. 8: 4 נָתַתְּ תִּיבוֹתָא עַל טוּרֵי קַרְדּוֹ *upon the Carducian mountains*, is rather to be taken collectively—*upon the Carducian range*, comp. also Job 21: 32.

2. The nouns מְרִין and רְבוּנִין, are employed as *Plur. excellentiae* (of a person), yet, on the whole, not with great frequency, Gen. 40: 1 לְרְבוּנֵיהוֹן לְמִלְכָּא דְּמִצְרַיִם, Isa. 1: 3 יָדַע הֶמְרָא אוּרְרָא דְּמִרְתִּי. On the contrary, the *Plur. אלהין* denotes always a plurality, 1 Sam. 6: 2; עֲלִיוֹנִין *the Most High*, as applied to God, is found only in the bibl. Chaldee, Dan. 7: 18.

3. The plural is also used for the designation of things which exist in pairs, where in Hebr. the *dual* is employed, e. g. Amos 4: 6 שְׁנִין, Exod. 11: 5 רֶחֱא, Num. 19: 36 מֵאֲזֻנֵּן. But where the Hebrew *dual* stood for objects which are two-fold in their nature, and expresses the numeral *two*, the writers of the Targums have added תְּרִין to the plural, e. g. Exod. 16: 29 תְּרִין יוֹמִין *biduum*.

4. A noun is doubled, stands twice in succession: a) Without a *copula*, in order to denote *multitude, abundance*, Gen. 14: 10 בִּירֵין בִּירֵין (Vulg. *puteos multos*), Joel 3: 14 מִשְׁרְרֵן מִשְׁרְרֵן *hosts on hosts*, or to describe a *distribution*, or the idea of *every*, Gen. 32: 16 חֲטָרָא חֲטָרָא *every herd singly, herd by herd*, Num. 14: 2 חֲטָרָא חֲטָרָא, 2 Kings 17: 29 עַמָּא עַמָּא *nation by nation*, Num. 9: 10 גִּבְר גִּבְר *man by man*. b) With the *copula* ו between them, in order to express a *diversity* or a *progress*, Deut. 25: 13 מִתְּקַל וּמִתְּקַל *diverse* (two kinds of) *weights*, Esth 3: 4 יוֹמָא וְיוֹמָא *day by day, daily*.

Of a different nature from this is the repetition of a word in the ani-

mation of discourse. Deut. 16: 20. Jer. 4: 10. comp. Isa. 52: 11. Cant. 6: 12. This belongs to the province of rhetoric, not of grammar.

§ 56.

*Designation of the Cases.*

1. The relation of Genitive is expressed either, as in Hebrew, by the *stat. constr.* (§ 32. 2), or, which is more common, by the  $\dot{\text{ד}}$  (*praeifixum*) or  $\text{די}$  before the second word; examples of both methods are:  $\text{אֲשֶׁרָא דִּי בֵּית אֱלֹהָא מְלָכָא דְאַרְעָא, מְלִי מְלָכָא}$ , Ezra 5: 16,  $\text{שְׁלִיטָא דִּי מְלָכָא}$  Dan. 2: 15.  $\text{עָנָא דְאַבְדִּיהִי}$  1 Sam. 17: 14,  $\text{עֲסָרָא טוֹלְמִין דְּלִתְמָא הָרִין}$  25: 18. In specifications of time  $\text{ל}$  also occurs as *nota Genitivi*, e. g. Gen. 8: 5  $\text{בְּחֵד לְיָרְחָא}$ , 2 Kings 12: 1  $\text{בְּשִׁנָּה שְׁבַע}$  *in the seven years of Jehu*, Ezek. 1: 5. The  $\text{ל}$  *auctoris* has also been retained in the titles of the Psalms. Further, the signification of the Genitive is sometimes objective, e. g. Gen. 7: 10. Jon.  $\text{דְּמִתּוּשָׁלַח אוֹבְלָה}$  *the mourning for Meth.* Job 3: 26. Isa. 53: 18  $\text{עֲמִצּוּדָא שְׁעִבּוּד}$  *subjection of the nations*, i. e. subjection which they effect, Gen. 3: 24  $\text{אֵילָן אוֹרֵחַ}$  *way to the tree*; the Genitive of the *material*, out of which anything is made, is likewise frequent in Chaldee, Dan. 5: 7  $\text{דְּהַקָּא דִּי הַמְּנִיכָא}$  comp. § 54. 1.

In the later Targums, this mode of representing the relation of the Genitive sometimes fails, e. g. Esth. 1: 9  $\text{מִשְׁתָּא נִשְׂיָא}$  Gen. 6: 17. 36: 21. Jon. In other places, on the contrary, it is expressed doubly: that is,  $\dot{\text{ד}}$ ,  $\text{די}$  is employed, although the *stat. constr.* precedes, e. g. Dan. 7: 10  $\text{נִהַר דִּי נֹר}$ , Gen. 2: 7  $\text{נִשְׁמַת דְּחַיִּי}$  4: 11. Jon.

The form of the *stat. constr.*, especially in the plural, stands often in the Targums for the *stat. absol.*, e. g. Gen. 1: 10  $\text{קָרָא יַמִּי}$ , Gen. 39: 20  $\text{בֵּית אֲסִירִי}$ , Prov. 12: 24  $\text{רַמְאִי יְהוֹן לְמָסָא}$  Prov. 1: 22. 10: 26. 12: 24. Gen. 37: 32. Job 3: 26. 1 Chron. 22: 15. Exod. 5: 11. See above § 31. 2.

2. The characteristic sign of the Dative is  $\text{ל}$ , that of the Accusative  $\text{ל}$  (almost always in the Targum of the Proverbs), or more commonly  $\text{ית}$ : yet the latter is often without any designation at all, and its relation as the object-case must be deduced from the simple structure of the sentence. The Vocative is generally ex-



pressed by the form of the *stat. emph.*, e. g. Jer. 22: 29 אֲרָעָא דְיִשְׂרָאֵל אֲרָעָא קִבְיָלָי.

## § 57.

*The Noun in the Designation of subordinate Relations.*

1. In addition to the office of the noun, when governed directly by another noun or a verb, it occurs in sentences as co-ordinate, in order to denote\* certain dependent relations, or qualifying circumstances. These are, a) most frequently designations of time and measure, more rarely of place (in answer to the question *where?*) Gen. 8: 12 שִׁבְעָא יוֹמִין עוֹד אֹרְרָךְ *he waited still seven days*, Jon. 2: 1. Judg. 14: 12 אִם תְּחַוֶּינָהּ נָתַתָּה לִי שִׁבְעַת יוֹמֵי מִשְׁתָּחָא *will ye declare it to me the seven (in the course of the seven) days of the feast*, 1 Sam. 15: 15. Exod. 12: 30 קָם פֶּרְעֹה לַיְלָאָה *Pharaoh rose up by night*, Gen. 7: 20 חֲמֵשׁ עֶשְׂרֵי אַמִּין מִלְּגָלָא תְּקִיפוּ מֵיָא *the water rose fifteen cubits*, Gen. 38: 11 תְּבִי אֲרָמְלָא בֵּיתָא אֲבוּיָהּ *remain . . . in the house of thy father*.

Motion to a place is usually denoted by לְ, 1 Kings 11: 40. Gen. 27: 3. 18: 22. Obad. 3; residence in a place by בְּ, Gen. 18: 1. In designations of time, בְּ stands often also in answer to the question *when*, e. g. Gen. 19: 5 בְּלַיְלָאָה *in the night*.

2. In other instances, b) such a qualifying noun is designed to limit a single, comprehensive idea, and can then be translated by *in respect to*, e. g. Gen. 41: 40 אֲתִי וְקִיר מִנֶּנָּה *in respect to the throne will I be more honored*, Lam. 4: 7 מִן יוֹתֵיר מִן סְמִיקוֹ חַיּוֹ וְיִתֵּיר מִן רֵדְדוֹ *redder of countenance than*, etc. Esth. 2: 2. This construction is, however, less common than in Hebrew, and the writers of the Targums have often employed for it the preposition בְּ, 2 Sam. 21: 20. 1 Kings 15: 23, or some other expression, Deut. 33: 11.

3. More rarely, c) we find it used to express adverbial modi-

\* The Greeks employ here commonly the Accusative; but in a language where the idea of case was so imperfectly apprehended, we should hardly be authorized to speak of an Accusative as *casus adverbialis*. The Hebrews and Aramaeans used the noun directly in such cases, without having any thought about its particular government in the sentence.

fications in general, e. g. Josh. 9: 2 קָרְבָּא לְאַנְחָא אֶחָדָנְשׁוּ *they assembled themselves together to fight, a multitude*, i. e. iunctim comp. § 37. 3. But where this phraseology occurred in the Hebrew, the Targumists have more frequently selected another mode of expression, 1 Sam. 15: 32. Ezek. 11: 13.

## § 58.

*Expression of the Comparative and Superlative.*

1. The comparative of adjectives is expressed, as in Hebrew, by prefixing the preposition מִן to the object with which the comparison is made, e. g. Gen. 3: 1 מִכָּל חַיָּה בָרָא *more subtle than all animals* (separating himself in respect to subtilty *from* all animals, leaving them behind himself), Ezek. 28: 3 הָאִישׁ חָכֵם מִכָּל־אִישׁ, Gen. 4: 8. Jon. טָב טָבִין מִדִּידָךְ *better than thine*, 3: 24. Jon. Deut. 7: 14. Jon. 4: 8 טָב דָּאֲמִית מִדָּאֲחֵי *it is better that I die, than that I live*. Sometimes וְיֵהִיר or יוֹהֵר is added for the purpose of rendering the comparison still stronger (*multo*), Eccl. 7: 2 וְיֵהִיר מִמֶּשְׁחָא *it is better that I die, than that I live*, Ps. 119: 103 בְּסִימֵן וְיֵהִיר מִן דּוֹבֶשֶׂא, Amos 6: 2. Ruth 1: 3 מְרִיר לִי מְרִיר מִן־לְךָ. The latter example must be viewed at the same time as brachylógical: *it is more bitter for me than for you (quam vobis)*, comp. מִלְכּוֹן; a construction which occurs oftener in comparative sentences, e. g. Joel 1: 6 לְיִבּוֹהֵי קָבֵר אֶרְוֹן for קָבֵר אֶרְוֵי בְרֵא, Isa. 5: 29 כְּאֶרְוֵי לֵה כְּאֶרְוֵי. See also Deut. 1: 17.

2. The superlative is indicated by modes of expression similar to those in Hebrew, e. g. Ps. 94: 8 שְׂרָרָן בְּעַמָּא *the stupid among the people*, i. e. *the most stupid*, Dan. 4: 14 שְׂפַל אֲנָשִׁים *the lowest*, Isa. 53: 7 שְׁמַיָּא שְׁמַיָּא *the highest heaven*, Exod. 26: 33 קֹדֶשׁ קֹדֶשֶׁן *the most holy place*, Dan. 2: 37 מְלִכָּא מְלִכָּא *the mightiest king*.

On the contrary, phrases like טָב טָב or לְחָדָא Gen. 1: 31, denote merely a *very high degree*; they do not, therefore, belong here.

## § 59.

*Construction of the Numerals.*

1. The Numerals from 2—10, when they are used adjectively (in *stat. absol.*), can stand either before or after the substantive, a) Gen. 8: 10 תִּלְקָא בָּנִין Lev. 27: 6 חֲמִשׁ סִלְעִין Gen. 6: 10 תִּלְקָא בָּנִין Judg. 14: 17; — b) Dan. 3: 24 גְּבָרִין תִּלְקָא 3: 25 גִּבּוֹרִים comp. Ezra 6: 4. Dan. 6: 3. 7: 7. 1 Sam. 1: 24. If the Numeral is used in the *stat. constr.*, as is often the case in Hebrew, and hence substantively (*a threeness of men for three men*), it then naturally precedes the noun, e. g. Num. 2: 3. Jon. אַרְבַּעַתִּי מִילָן, Num. 34: 13. Onk. תְּשִׁיעַת שְׁבָטִין, 1 Sam. 24: 8. 2 Sam. 9: 10. Gen. 29: 29. Jon.

2. The Numerals from 11—19 and 20—100 stand before the substantive Plur., 2 Sam. 9: 10 חֲמִשָּׁת עָסָר בָּנִין, Exod. 26: 25 שְׁתֵּי עָסָר, Num. 1: 44 הָרִי עָשָׂר גְּבָרִין, 2 Kings 13: 10 שְׁנֵי עָסָר שָׁנִין, Lev. 27: 7 חֲמִשׁ עָסָר סִלְעִין, Exod. 26: 19 אַרְבָּעִין סָמָדִין, Judg. 11: 33 עֶשְׂרִין קָרוֹן, Gen. 7: 4 אַרְבָּעִין רֶמֶסִין. The tens, however, are also placed after the noun in giving total numbers, e. g. Gen. 32: 14 sq. עֶסְרִין וְכָרִי עֶסְרִין וְחֲמִשָּׁא עֶסְרִין וְכָרִי etc., somewhat as we say—goats 200, bucks 20, rams 20, etc.

A *half* is expressed in a similar manner to that in Hebrew, viz. ; *three halves by two and a half*, Exod. 25: 10 תְּרֵינִי וְחֵמֶשׁ, *nine and a half* Josh. 14: 2 תְּשִׁיעַת וְחֵמֶשׁ שְׁבָטִין וְחֵמֶשׁ שְׁבָטִין *nine tribes and the half of a tribe*. The fractional numbers  $\frac{1}{4}$ ,  $\frac{1}{5}$ ,  $\frac{2}{3}$ , etc. are formed either by separate substantives, as חֲמִשָּׁה *a fifth part*, or described by the participle מֵן, e. g. Ezek. 4: 11 מֵן שְׁתֵּי חִינִיָּה *one sixth of a hin*, Exod. 16: 36 עֹמֶר חֵד מֵן עֹמֶר בְּחֵלֶת סֵאִין *an omer is  $\frac{1}{3}$  of three seahs*.

In designations of measure and weight, the word denoting these ideas, is sometimes omitted, Gen. 37: 28 בְּעֶשְׂרִין כֶּסֶף *for 20 (shekels) of silver*. But in most of the passages, where this ellipsis occurs in Hebrew, the Targumists have supplied the substantive, comp. Gen. 20: 16. 24: 22. Ruth 3: 15. In designations of time, the word יוֹמָא is more frequently wanting, Gen. 8: 13. Lev. 23: 32.

3. Instead of the ordinal numbers, so far as such exist, viz. 1—10 and 11—19, the Cardinals may be employed in designations



of time, as occasionally in English, 2 Kings 12: 1 בְּשָׁנָה שֶׁבַע לִיהוּדָא *in the year seven of Jehu*, Num. 7: 22 בְּיוֹמָא חַד עָשָׂר *on the day eleven*, Jer. 39: 2; so also (with the ellipsis above mentioned), Gen. 8: 13 בַּחֹדֶשׁ הַרְּאשִׁית *on the first (day) of the month*, Lev. 23: 32.

4. The Distributives are expressed by repeating the Cardinals (without the copula ו), Gen. 7: 2 שֶׁבַע שֶׁבַע שֶׁבַע *seven seven, by sevens*, Gen. 7: 9 תְּרִין תְּרִין *bini, in pairs*, Gen. 18: 29 sq. Jon. אֶשְׂרָא אֶשְׂרָא *deni*.

5. The numeral adverbs, *a)* which denote *fold*, are represented by the Cardinals with חַד prefixed, e. g. Dan. 3: 19 חַד שֶׁבַע־פֶּה *seven-fold* (another mode of designation, see 2 Sam. 12: 6 אַרְבָּעִין עַל חַד); — *b)* those which denote *times*, by the addition of זְמָנָא, Josh. 6: 3 זְמָנָא חָדָא *one time, once*, Gen. 27: 36 זְמַנִּין תְּרִיתִין *twice*, Exod. 34: 23 תְּלַת זְמַנִּין *three times*, 2 Kings 6: 10 עָשָׂר זְמַנִּין *ten times*, Gen. 31: 7. זְמָנָא, however, is also omitted, e. g. Gen. 3: 14. Jon. חָדָא חֲנִין *once in seven years*.

## § 60.

*Construction of Adjectives.*

1. The adjective, as predicate of a sentence, may stand *before* or *after* the subject, the latter, e. g. Gen. 19: 20 קָרְחָא הָדָא קָרִיבָא, Prov. 15: 15 כָּל־יוֹמִי דְּמַסְכֵּנָא בִּי שֵׁין. The adjective is placed first, when an emphasis is intended to be expressed, e. g. Gen. 4: 13 סָגִי הוּבִי, Ps. 33: 4 תִּקְוִין פִּתְּחָנָא דְּרִי, Eccl. 7: 2 טַב שְׂפָא טָבָא 2 Chron. 24: 11.

2. The principal (yet only apparent) exception to the rule, that the adjective must agree with its noun, is that collectives in the *Sing.*, take a predicate in the *Plur.* (comp. above § 49. 1), 2 Sam. 3: 1 בֵּית דָּוִד אֲזַלִּין וְתַקְרִיפִין, 1 Sam. 6: 13 בֵּית שָׁמֶשׁ תְּחַדִּין Joel 2: 8. Exod. 20: 18. In this construction, the *Fem. Sing.* (as abstract) is commonly connected with the *Masc.* of the predicate.

3. If the adjective denote an attribute, it stands regularly after its substantive, Gen. 1: 16 נְהוֹרִיין רְבֻרְבִין, Dan. 2: 9 מְלָה כְּדָבָה Dan. 2: 10, 48 מִתְּקֵן רְבֻרְבֵן Prov. 17: 1. Ps. 141: 2. Gen. 6: 3, — though sometimes separated from it by several words (where the idea of

the adjective is to be more strongly presented) Joel 2: 6 עָמָא  
2: 31. סֵלִיק עַל עֲרֵעֵי תַּקְוָה.

4. If a substantive be subjoined to an adjective for the purpose of limiting more exactly its application, the former stands in the *stat. constr.* (*in respect to*) Prov. 16: 19 שָׂפֵל רוּחַ, Ps. 24: 4 כָּרִיר רַעֲיוֹנָא, Isa. 53: 9 עֲתִירִי נִכְסֶיָא, Job 34: 34 חֲבִימֵי לָבָא, Deut. 28: 50. Esth. 1: 11 שְׂפִירַת חַיּוּוּ. The preposition בְּ is sometimes prefixed to the substantive, Gen. 39: 6 רָאִי בְּהִזְוֶא; more rarely, the limiting substantive is joined to the adjective without any construction to mark the closeness of the relation, comp. § 57. 2.

5. The neuter of adjectives (and numerals) is ordinarily expressed by the *Femin.*, Gen. 42: 30 כָּשִׁיךְ *dura*, Isa. 53: 8. Joel 2: 26 פְּרִישָׁן *mirabilia*, Deut. 10: 21. Ps. 27: 4 חֶדָא בְּעִיתִי *unum petii*.

## § 61.

### *Nominative Absolute.*

The noun is sometimes placed as subject before a sentence grammatically complete, without any dependence upon it for government (*nominativus absolutus*), e. g. Dan. 5: 6 אֲדִין מֶלֶכָא וְרַעְיוֹנֵהוּ וְרַעְיוֹנֵהוּ שְׁנוּהֵי זִיּוּהֵי *so then the king, his color changed and his thoughts terrified him*, 2 Chron. 13: 10 וַאֲנַחְנָא מִמָּרָא דִּי בְּסַעְדָּנָא. This takes place particularly in sentences of more than ordinary length. In this case, the subject, sometimes for the sake of greater simplicity of construction, sometimes in order to direct attention more strongly to the principal word, is placed as *exponendum* at the head of the sentence. Comp. Dan. 2: 30 אֲנָה דְּנִינְאֵל שְׁגִירָא רַעֲיוֹנִי וּבְהִלָּנִי 7: 28 וַאֲנָא--רָזָא דְּנָה גָּלִי לִי, Exod. 32: 1 מִשֶּׁה - - לֹא יִרְעָנָא מָה הָיָא לִיָּה, Num. 14: 24 עֲבָדִי כָּלֵב - - וַאֲשַׁלְּנָה, Jer. 18: 23. 23: 17. Lev. 10: 19. T. H. Gen. 4: 24. Jon.

## CHAPTER IV.

### Syntax of the Particles.

#### § 62.

#### *Adverbs and Prepositions.*

1. Adverbs repeated denote, *a*) a very high degree (§ 58. 2. Rem.), Gen. 7: 19 מְאֹד מְאֹד מְאֹד *very much, extraordinarily*; *b*) a progress or augmentation, Exod. 23: 30 זָעִיר וְזָעִיר (of time) *a little, a little, i. e. by and by, paulatim*, Deut. 28: 43. (Ewald, Krit. Gramm. p. 638).

For the manner in which certain adverbs are expressed by verbs, see § 52.

2. The prepositions which stand before a noun, are often not repeated before a word in apposition, Jon. 3: 2 אֶזְרָא לְיִנְיָהּ קָרָא רַבָּהָא, 1 Sam. 25: 14 לְאַבְיִגַּיִל אֵתָה נָבֵל, 14: 39 בְּיוֹנָהן בְּרִי, Gen. 23: 18. 32: 18; on the contrary, 1 Sam. 25: 8 לְדָוִד, 2 Chron. 31: 4. Gen. 40: 1. Jon. In like manner, the preposition is sometimes written once in the case of several words connected by *and*; as, Gen. 18: 27. Jon. אֶזְרָא מְהִיל לְעֶפֶר וְקָטָם, Esth. 1: 11.; sometimes it is repeated before each, e.g. Gen. 19: 24. Jon. אֵתָה מִיִּטְרִין עַל סְדוֹם וְעַל עֲמוֹרָה, 40: 1 sq.

#### § 63.

#### *Use of the Negatives.*

1. The two negative particles לֹא and לֹיֵא are in their use as distinct from each other, as in Hebrew אֵין and לֹא. The former, as derived from אֵיִת, לֹא, includes always necessarily the verb of *existence*, e.g. Gen. 38: 29 לֹיֵא יוֹסֶה בְּגוֹבָא, and hence stands often with pronouns or participles, Exod. 5: 10 לֹיֵא אֶנָּה יִהְיֶה *I give not*, see § 47. 1.

2. In oaths אֵין or אֵם is constantly to be taken in sense as *negative*, because an ellipsis of the apodosis occurs in such phrases,



e. g. Isa. 62: 8 אֲנִי אֶם אֶתֵּן *I will not give*, pp. *if I give*, I will not live (Ezek. 5: 11); Gen. 14: 23 אֲנִי אֶם אֶסָּב *I will not receive*. On the other hand, אֲנִי לֵא *is affirmative*, Josh. 14: 9. Isa. 5: 9.

3. *That not* is frequently denoted by מִלְ before the *Infinitive*, e. g. Lev. 26: 19 אֲנִי יְהוָה שֶׁמֶיָּא תִקְרִיפִין מִלְאַחֲרָא מִטָּרָא *that they pour not down rain* (pp. *from pouring down*), 2 Chron. 25: 13.

## § 64.

### *The Particles of Interrogation.*

1. The simple question is denoted either by the *præfix* הֲ or not at all, and in the latter case must be discovered solely from the context, comp. Gen. 27: 24. 2 Sam. 18: 29.

2. The double question is generally expressed by הֲ - אִם, Num. 13: 20 הֲטָבָא אִם בִּישָׁא, 1 Kings 22: 15 הֲנִזִּיל - אִם נִהְמַנֵּעַ.

3. The question with הֲלָא (*nonne*) is often employed in such a manner as to serve merely to awaken attention, and הֲלָא can be translated—*behold*, Deut. 11: 30 הֲלָא אֲנִיִּן בְּעֵבְרָא דִּירְדֵּנָא *behold, they lie on the other side of the Jordan*, 1 Sam. 20: 37 הֲלָא גִירָא, 2 Kings 15: 21 הֲלָא אֲנִיִּן כְּתִירְבִּין, Isa. 5: 20.

# APPENDIX.

BY THE TRANSLATOR.

---

## NO. 1. TARGUMS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

See Gr. p. 9.

THE reference which is made here to the Targums, and which occurs so constantly in the subsequent pages of the Grammar, may render it convenient for the student to have before him some information respecting their origin and character. The following are the principal facts in relation to them, as stated by the best authorities on the subject.

### 1. *Their origin.*

The term *Targum* is a Chaldee word תרגום, תרגומא *translation*, from תרגם (quadrilit.) *to translate*. See Buxtorf, pp. 26, 42. The oriental Jews applied it at first to any translation from one language into another; but in process of time they came to employ it by way of eminence of those translations of the Hebrew Scriptures into Chaldee or the popular dialect of Palestine, which were made for the benefit of the common people and which the change of their language during the Babylonish captivity had rendered necessary. The more immediate occasion which led to these translations was the establishment of the synagogue-worship, so generally practised after the reign of the Seleucidae. Even as early, however, as the time of Ezra (Neh. 8: 8), the law was read publicly with an accompanying oral translation into Chaldee; and the practice, thus introduced, undoubtedly perpetuated itself with various modifications and changes in the mode, till the wants of the nation produced our present written translations or the Targums so called. These translations in the first instance were confined, most probably, to those books or parts of books of the Old Testament, which were read in the synagogues; but by degrees they extended themselves, as was natural, to the remaining portions.

## 2. *The Targum of Onkelos.*

This embraces the whole of the Pentateuch ; and of all the Chaldee translations none was held by the Jews in higher estimation than this. The purity of its language and its general fidelity to the original were among the principal causes which gave it this pre-eminence. Of the person and history of Onkelos we possess only very scanty and uncertain information. The writers of the Babylonian Talmud allude to him occasionally ; but not with much fulness, or even indeed with entire consistency in their accounts. The best supported opinion perhaps is that he flourished a short time before the birth of Christ, that he was a pupil of the celebrated Hillel, the grandfather of Gamaliel the teacher of Paul, and that residing himself at Jerusalem, he translated the Pentateuch for the use of the Palestine Jews. The tradition (which is not, however, a uniform one, but appears only in some of the Jewish writings) that he was a Roman by birth and became a proselyte to Judaism, arose probably from his being confounded with another translator of the Old Testament, of whom this was true. Eichhorn and Bertholdt dissent from this view in part ; they maintain that he was a native, not of Palestine, but of Babylon, and appeal in evidence of this to the character of his Chaldee, and the fact that neither the Jerusalem Gemara nor the church fathers, Origen and Jerome, make any mention of him. But to this those who support the other opinion reply, in the first place, that we have no contemporary monuments of the Chaldee dialect as spoken in Palestine in the age of Onkelos, and hence that it is impossible for us to judge whether he has employed a language more or less pure than that which existed among the Palestine Jews at that period. In the second place, the mere silence of the Jerusalem Gemara deserves but little weight, because it cannot be shown that the writers of it had any necessary occasion for speaking of Onkelos, and because it stands opposed to positive testimony from other sources, asserting explicitly his Palestine origin. Finally, as to the fathers referred to, it is allowed that they have left us no record of their opinion on this subject ; and considering how limited an acquaintance they had with the literature of the Old Testament, that they appear to have confined themselves in their inquiries respecting it to the Hebrew text and the Greek translations made from it, it is not surprising that they have said nothing in respect to the authorship of the Targum in question.

The view of the linguistic character of this Targum, expressed by Winer in the body of the Grammar, is that which scholars generally



entertain. Hävernicks remarks, somewhat more in detail, that the language of Onkelos, while it exhibits a Hebrew coloring, is still less Hebraistic than the biblical Chaldee; that it avoids numerous Aramaeisms, which prevailed at a later period (such as the contraction of nouns); that it contains comparatively few words of Greek origin, and none at all from the Latin; while, on the other hand, it is not free from a number of obsolete or obscure expressions which even the Talmudists were unable to explain. His style of translation is in general remarkably literal; and the term *paraphrase*, which has been so extensively applied to this class of writings, is by no means just in its application here. The occasional deviations from this method which present themselves, consist for the most part of a change in the words or construction for the sake of greater clearness, for the explanation of tropical terms, for the sake of euphemism, or for the purpose of avoiding expressions which were supposed to savor in any way of heathenism, or to be wanting in a proper reverence for the Deity. To this uniform character of the translation, only occasional exceptions occur. One of the most remarkable of these is furnished in the manner in which Onkelos has translated or rather paraphrased the forty-ninth chapter of Genesis. His freedom here is so great that it is almost impossible to identify it with the original.

### 3. *The Targum of Jonathan on the Prophets.*

The Jonathan to whom this Targum is attributed, is usually termed Jonathan ben Uziel. The Jews show the estimation in which they held him by the high antiquity which they ascribe to him, and by the source from which they say he received his version. Some of their writers make him a contemporary of the prophets Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, and affirm that he was aided by their special co-operation in the performance of his labor. His translation embraces the prophets of the Old Testament according to the Jewish application of this term; that is, the books of Joshua, Judges, 2 Samuel, 2 Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the twelve minor prophets. The Jewish fiction as to the time when he lived is of course worthless; but critics are far from being agreed in respect to the period to which he really belongs. Not a few of them suppose that he is older somewhat than Onkelos, on the ground partly of intimations which seem to imply this in the Talmud. But the evidence from this source is by no means uniform, and is too slight to establish an opinion either way. The probability is, that there was no very great interval between them;

but it is impossible to say certainly to which of them the higher antiquity belongs. It has been said that the Targum of Onkelos shows an acquaintance with that of Jonathan, and must have been therefore, subsequent to it; but the resemblance between them, which is alleged to exist in certain passages, is not great, and could be explained equally well by the contrary supposition, that Onkelos wrote first, and that Jonathan borrowed from him.

The view of Eichhorn and some other critics that the writer of this Targum must have lived as late certainly as the second or third century after Christ, is now almost universally discarded. They attribute a character to the Targum in affirming this, which it does not possess. It was said by them that the writer of it discovers an evident anxiety to explain away the Messiah from those passages which Christians are accustomed to refer to him, and that he must have lived consequently after Judaism and Christianity had come into collision with each other. But Gesenius denies altogether the correctness of this representation. He pronounces it entirely at variance with the facts in the case—an assertion which no one would make who had carefully read this version for himself. He affirms, on the contrary, that the most important passages which Christians regard as Messianic are recognized as having this character here; and, in general, that the Hebrew prophecies are explained here in remarkable coincidence with the manner in which they are applied in the New Testament. The writer acknowledges, for instance, the doctrine of a suffering and atoning Messiah as taught in the prophets, and explains, in accordance with this idea, the memorable declarations relating to this subject in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah.

In his style of translation, this author is much more free than Onkelos, so that his work may be termed a paraphrase rather than a version. He carries this characteristic so far as frequently to sacrifice the sense of the sacred writers. He gives us in many instances the traditions and dogmatic views of his time, or, possibly, his own individual fancies, instead of the meaning of the Hebrew. He has taken this license more especially in the prophetic books; in the historical, he has shown himself much more true to the original. His language resembles very much that of Onkelos. According to Eichhorn, and Bertholdt, he is said to be full of foreign words; but, this multitude of foreign words, says Gesenius, I confess myself unable to discover, and find the judgment of Carpzov fully confirmed, who ascribes to him *nitorem sermonis Chaldaei et dictionis puritatem, ad Onkelosum proxime accedentem et parum deflectentem a puro tersoque Chaldaismo biblico.*



#### 4. *The Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan on the Pentateuch.*

The Targum so designated was also attributed by some of the Jews to the Jonathan ben Uziel, who wrote the one last described. But the grounds which disprove such an authorship of it are perfectly decisive. Some of these are: first, the barbarian and heterogeneous character of the dialect, which contains a multitude of foreign words, particularly from the Persian, Greek and Latin languages; second, the evident use which the author, whoever he was, has made of the Targum of Onkelos;\* third, the numerous allusions which occur in it to subjects several centuries later than the time of the true Jonathan; as, for example, the mentioning of Constantinople (Num. 24: 19), Lombardy (ib. v. 24), of the Mishna, which originated as late at least as the middle of the second century; and finally, the circumstance that among all the Jewish writers of the middle ages no one discovers any knowledge of any Targum on the books of Moses, except that of Onkelos. Most critics would bring down its origin as late as the ninth century; some few, by assuming the interpolation of such passages as treat of more modern subjects, suppose it possible that the bulk of it may have been produced as early as the fourth or third century; but all admit that the author is unknown. His object as inferred from the production itself, seems to have been, not so much to promote a correct knowledge of the Pentateuch, as to advance his own particular opinions; or, more probably in most cases, those of his cotemporaries on various topics which he has forced upon the sacred text rather than found in it. He has paraphrased the original with even greater freedom than either of the Targumists already mentioned. With this professed translation he has intermixed numberless tales and fictions, the absurdity of which is exceeded by nothing except the similar narrations in the collections of the Talmud.

#### 5. *The Jerusalem Targum on the Pentateuch.*

The work which bears this title, is not so much an original work as a fragmentary recension of the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan on the Pentateuch. It does not extend over the whole five books of Moses, but omits extensive portions of them, sometimes entire chapters, and still more frequently several successive verses. It consists of translations and remarks gathered from various writers, especially from the

---

\* This argument, it is obvious, is valid only in case it be allowed that the age of Jonathan is earlier than that of Onkelos. As has been stated, this is a disputed point.



Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan. The greater part of these, it has been conjectured, may have been collected at first by some student for his own private use; and these, afterwards passing into other hands, may have been gradually increased to their present size. The manifest want of unity, which characterizes them, renders it impossible that they should be from a single writer. The Chaldee of this Targum is very impure. It abounds in Latin, Greek, and Persian words, and shows decidedly the reflection of a comparatively modern age. It cannot be referred, possibly, to a higher antiquity than the sixth century, and may have been composed much more recently still. The decision of this question would depend in part, obviously, on the date which we assign to the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan, upon which it shows so close a dependence.

#### 6. *The remaining Targums.*

There are still other Chaldee translations of parts of the Old Testament; but either from the age in which they were produced, or from their inferiority in respect to language or exegetical value, they have acquired much less importance than those which have been noticed. These are a Targum on Proverbs, Job and the Psalms, one on the five *Megilloth* as they are called, viz. Ruth, Esther, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes and Canticles, and one on the Chronicles. These are usually cited, for the sake of convenience, as the Targum on the Hagiographa, though they do not coincide precisely with the division which the Jews were accustomed to designate by this term. The book of Esther, on account of its peculiar historical interest, was a favorite one with the later Jews, and exists in two other Targums besides that mentioned above. No one holds any longer to the Jewish tradition, which attributes the Targums to a single translator; for it is inconsistent with the undeniable diversity of style and character which they exhibit. The five *Megilloth*, says Zunz (p. 65), may have proceeded possibly from the same hand; both their association as a class and a certain resemblance of language renders this not improbable. On this latter ground particularly, it has been supposed that the version of Job, the Psalms and Proverbs may have been the work of the same individual. Still less foundation is there for the opinion of some of the later Jews, that these translations were made by Joseph the Blind, as he is called, who lived in the first part of the fourth century and presided over a school at Sora in Babylonia. Such an early production of them is not consistent with their contents, and is disproved by the ar-

guments and testimony of Jewish writers of the thirteenth century. They are, in all probability, the most recent of all the Chaldee versions. It is one proof of this that they betray, in their formation, undeniable evidence of the use of Pseudo-Jonathan and the Jerusalem Targum on the part of their authors.

The Targums here in question exhibit very different degrees of fidelity to the original, and possess consequently very different degrees of value for the interpreter. That on the Proverbs is distinguished above the others for its adherence to the text, the deviations from it being few and unimportant. Next to this in point of accuracy stands the version of Job and Psalms. All these three books exhibit, as compared with the others, a striking agreement with the Syriac translation; but yet not greater in the opinion of many critics, than might naturally have resulted from the similarity of the dialects in which they are written, and from their common conformity to the Hebrew text. The supposition that these portions were translated from the Syriac rather than the Hebrew, cannot be established by any sufficient evidence, drawn from this circumstance.

In addition to the Targums which have now been mentioned, the writers of the Talmud refer also to others, of which no trace can any longer be found. From the nature of the case, it cannot well be supposed that the Chaldee versions which have come down to us or which are known to us (for some may still exist that have not been brought to light), are the only ones which were ever made. On the contrary, considering how widely dispersed the Jews were, and for how long a time and how extensively they employed some form of this dialect, we can readily imagine that such translations may have been multiplied to almost any extent.

### 7. *Sources of Information.*

Among the writers that may be consulted in relation to the Targums, are—Gesenius, *Comm. über Jesaia*, Einl. p. 65 sq. Zunz, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden*, p. 65 sq. Hävernicks, Einl. in das A. Test. zweite Abh. p. 73 sq. Winer, *De Onkeloso ejusque paraphrasi Chald.* Eichhorn, Einl. in das A. Test. erst. B. p. 430 sq. De Wette, Einl., etc., p. 89 sq.; Mr. Parker's *Translation of the same*, Vol. I. p. 210 sq. Herbst, Einl. in das A. T. erst. Th. p. 173 sq. Rosenmüller, *Handbuch für d. Literat.* III. 3 sq. Danz, *Universal-Wörterbuch*, etc., art. *Targumim*. Jahn, *Intr. to the O. Test.* p. 64 sq. Horne, *Intr.* V. II. p. 157 sq., etc.

8. *Editions of the Targums.*

The Targums have been frequently printed both separately and in connection with other works. The following very full, if not complete, list of these publications, is taken from Dr. Petermann's recent Chaldee Grammar.\* The Rabbinic Bibles, as they are called, and which contain these Targums either entirely or in part, I omit for the sake of brevity.

## 1. Targum Onkelosi in Pentateuchum.

Pentateuchus Hebr. et Chald. c. commentar. Raschii. Bononiae 1482. fol. editio princeps..

Pentateuchus Hebr. et Chald. sine punctis, cum commentar. Raschii. Venet. Bomberg 1523. fol.

*Idem* Hebr. et Chald. cum quinque Megilloth Hebr. ibid. 1527. 8.

*Idem.* Hebr. et Chald. cum 5 Megilloth. ibid. 1543. 8.

Targum Onkelosi Latine versum ab *Alphonso de Zamora* (e bibl. Polyglottis Compl. deinde ab *Aria Montano* recogn et emend.) seorsim editum. Antwerp. 1835. 8. et cum versione bibliorum Latina Vulgata. Venet. 1609. fol. et Antwerp. 1616. fol.

*Pauli Fagii* expositio dictionum Hebraic. literalis et simplex in IV. priora capita Geneseos. Isnae 1542. 4.

(In calce adjecta est Paraphrasis Chald. Onkelosi in eadem capita cum. vers. Lat.)

Targum h. e. Paraphrasis Onkeli Chald. in sacra biblia, ex Chald. in Lat. fidelissime versa, additis in singula fere capita succinctis annotationibus. Autore *Paulo Fagio*. Pentateuchus. Tomus I. (et unicus). Argentorati 1546. fol.

Pentateuchus c. Targ. Onkelosi, vers. arab. Saadiae, vers. persica Tawus et commentario Raschii. Constantinop. 1546. fol.

Pentateuchus Hebr. et Chald. cum Megilloth (Hebr.) et Haphtharoth. Venet. apud M. A. Justinianum. 1547. 8.

*Idem* Hebr. et Chald. cum commentariis Rabbin. et 5 Megilloth Hebr. et Chald. cum commentar. Raschii. Venet. per Dan. Bomberg. 1548. fol.

Pentateuchus Hebr. et Chald. cum comment. Rabbin., item 5 Megilloth Hebr. et Chald. Cracov. apud Isaac ben Aaron Prostitz. 1587. fol.

Pentateuchus Hebr. et Chald. cum comment. Rabbin. . item 5 Megilloth cum Targum et Raschi, ac denique Haphtharoth c. comm. Kimchi. Basil. 1606. fol. ap. Conr. Waldkirch.

Pentateuchus cum comment. Rabb.; item 5 Megilloth cum Targum et Raschi, et Haphtharoth. Prag apud Mosen ben Jos. ben Bezalel. 1618. 2 Voll. 4.

---

\* A notice of this Grammar will be found in the Christian Review, June, 1845, p. 313sq.



**Pentateuchus** Hebr. et Chald. et 5 Megilloth Hebr. Amstelod. Henr. Laurentii. 1631. 4.

Idem Hebr. et Chald. per Menasse ben Israel. Amsterold. 1631. 4.

Pentateuchus cum Targum et Raschi, item 5 Megilloth et Haphtharoth. Venet. per Joh. Martinelli. 1642 4.

Pentateuchus cum 5 Megilloth Hebr. et Chald. Venet. 1671. 8.  
etc. etc.

Cf. Le Long. *Biblioth. sacra* ed. Masch. Tom. I. p. 95. sqq. et

Wolfii Biblioth. Hebr. T. H. p. 385 sqq.

*With. Fr. Hezel, Geneseos ex Onkelosi Paraphrasi Chald. quatuor priora capita, una cum Danielis cap. II. Chaldaice. Leingov. 1788. 8.*

## II. Targum Pseudo-Jonathanis et Hierosolymitanum in Pentateuchum.

Pentateuchus Hebr. cum triplici Targum et comment. Raschi et 5  
Megilloth, cum ejusdem comment. et duplici Targum in Esther,  
cum praef. *R. Aschir Phorins*. Venet. de Gara. 1591. 8.

Pentateuchus cum Targum triplici, per quatuor columnas, itemque Raschii commentario contextui substrato. Venet. apud Jo. de Gara. 1594. 3 Voll.

Vol. tertio 5 Megilloth cum Targum et comm. Raschi item super Esther Targum Scheni (i. e. alterum) continentur.

**Targum Pseudo-Jonathanis in Pentateuchum cum duplici Paraphrasi in Esther.** Basil. apud Waldkirchium. 1697. fol.

Pentateuchus Hebr. cum triplici Targum, 5 Megilloth Hebr. et Chald.  
cum comment. Raschi, item Haphtharoth. Hanov. apud. Hans  
Jacob Hene. 1614. 8.

Expositio vocum difficiliorum in Targum Onkelosi, Jonathanis et Hierosolymitano obviarum, cum triplici isto Targum. Hanov. 1614. 8. et Amstelod. 1646. 4. per R. Pheibel ben David.

*Pentateuchus* Hebr. cum triplici Targum itemque 5 Megilloth Hebr. et Chald. Amstelod. per Menasse ben Israel. 1640. 4.

(Insunt praeterea comment. Raschi et Targum secundum super Esther, item Haphtharoth.)

Pentateuchus cum triplici Targum. Prag. 1646. 8.

Targum Hierosolymitanum in Pentateuchum Latine versum cum notis marginalibus ad illustranda loca difficiliora opera *Franc. Taiteri*. Londini 1649. 4.

Pentateuchus cum Targum Pseudo-Jonathanis et Hierosolymitano,  
item cum commentario rabb. Amst. Jos. Athias. 1671. fol.

Pentateuchus cum triplici Targum comment. Raschi, excerptis ex Bial Turim, 5 Megilloth cum Targum scheni (secundo) super Esther et Haphtharoth. Amstelod. apud Uri Veïbs 1670. 4. et ibid. apud David ben Uri Veïbs. 1674. 4.

Pentateuchus cum triplici versione Chald. tribusque commentariis Raschii, Raschbam et Aben Esrae, cura et typis *Dan. Ern. Jablonsky*. Berol. 1705. 5 tomi. 4 min.

Pentateuchus Hebr. cum paraphr. Chald. Onkelos et Jonathan, etc.  
Metz 1766. 4.

## III. Targum Jonathanis fil. Uzielis in prophetas priores et posteriores.

- Targum Jonathanis in Prophetas cum textu Hebr. et comment. Kimchii et Levi ben Gerson. Editio princeps. Leiriae (in Lusitan.) 1494. fol.
- Chaldaee Jonathae Uzielis filii interpretatio per *Joh. Mercerum*. Paris ex offic. Car. Steph. 1557. 4.
- Prophetæ posteriores cum Targum, item commentariis Raschii, Aben Esrae et Kimchii, variis item lectionibus ex multorum exemplarium diligenti collatione in margine adscriptis. Parisiis per Rob. Stephanum. 1556. 4.
- Jonathanis Targum in XII. Prophetas minores cum vers. Lat. *Joh. Merceri*. Paris 1559. 4.
- Targum Jonathanis in XII. Prophetas minores Latine versum ab *Imman. Tremellio*. Heidelberg. 1567. 8.
- Hoseas Hebr. et Chald. cum verss. Lat., commentariis Hebraicis Raschi, Aben Esrae et Dav. Kimchi, Masora item parva, ejusque et commentariorum Latina quoque a Jo. Mercero facta versione. Accedunt in fine succinctae sed necessariae annotationes *Guil. Coddaci*. Leidæ 1621. 4.
- Targum Jonathanis in Hoseam cum versione Lat. *Alph. de Zamora*. Leidæ 1621. 4.
- Idem sine versione Lat. Helmst. 1703. 4.
- Targum Jonathanis in Jonam. Utraj. 1657, et 1692. 8.
- Idem in Joelem et Abdiam. ibid. 1657. 8.
- Idem in Joelem et Micham. Witteb. 1565. fol.
- Idem in Abdiam. Bremæ 1673. 4.
- Hoseas Hebr. cum Targum Jonathanis et comment. Raschii, Aben Esrae et Kimchii cura *Herm. von der Hårdt*. Helmst. 1702. 4.
- Ed. II. cura *J. D. Michaelis*. Gött. 1775. 4.
- Hoseas, Joel, Amos, Abdias et Jonas, Hebr. et Chald. cum comment. Rabbiorum et Masora. Paris, apud Rob. Stephanum 1556. 4.
- Targum Jonathanis in Hoseam, Joelem et Amosum, ut et Anonymi Paraphrastæ in Ruth et Threnos Lat. vers. a *Quinquarboreo* cum notis ejusdem Paris 1556. 4.
- Targum Jonathanis in Joelem Lat. versum a *Gilb. Genebrardo*. Paris 1563. 4.
- Joel et Micha. Hebr. Chald. Gr. Lat. et Germ. studio *Jo. Draconitis*. Witteb. 1565. fol.
- Joel et Abdias Hebr. Chald. et Lat. c. comment. Rabbiorum, et notis philologicis (eodem ordine ut Jonas) auctore *Joh. Leusden*. Traj. ad Rh. 1657. 8.
- Amos, Obadia et Jonas Chald. per *J. Mercerum*. Paris, ex officina Car. Stephani. 1557. 4.
- Targum Jonathanis in Abdiam et Jonam Lat. vertit. *Joh. Mercerus*. Paris 1550. 4.
- Targum Jonathanis in Abdiam, Jonam et Sophoniam Lat. versum ab *Arnoldo Pontaco*. Paris 1566. 4.
- Obadiae prophetia Hebr. Chald. Syr. et Arab. speciminis loco edita

- per *Ludov. Mich. Crocium*. Brem. 1623. 4. (cum vers. Lat. et commentariis Rabb.)
- Obadias Hebr. et Chald. cum Masora utraque et tribus Rabbinis Jarchi, Aben Esra et Kimchi, studio *Matthaei Wasmuthi*. Jenae 1678. 12.
- Jonas Hebr. et Chald. cum Masora utraque, comment. Raschii, Aben Esrae, Kimchii et Abarbanelis, cura *Frederici Alberti Christiani*, Ex-Judaei, cujus Lexicon succinctum vocum Hebr. accedit. Lips. 1683. 8.
- Jonas illustratus Hebr. et Chald. et Latine, per paraphrasin Chaldaicam, Masoram magnam et parvam, et per trium Rabbiorum textum Rabbinicum punctatum, nec non per verias notas philologicas, auctore *Joh. Leusden*. Traj. ad Rh. 1656. 8. ed. II. 1692. 8.
- Jonas Vates expositus cum Targum Jonathanis, Masora utraque, Raschi, Esra, Kimchi, ben Melech et Abarbanel, cura *M. Georg. Christiani Burcklini*. Francof. a. M. 1697. 4.
- Micha, Nahum, Habacuc, Sophonia, Hagg., Zachar. Malach., Chald. Paris 1552. 4.
- Targum Jonathanis in Haggaeum Lat. vertit *Mercerus*. Paris 1551. 4.
- Malachias, Hebr. Chald. Gr. Lat. et Germ., studio *Eliac Hutteri*. Norimb. 1601. 4.

IV. Josephi Coeci Targum in Hagiographa.

- Psalmi Davidici Chaldaice. Rom. 1510. 4.
- Augustin. Justinianus*: Psalterium Hebraeum, Graec. Arab. et Chald. cum tribus Lat. interprett. et glossiss. Genuae 1516. fol.
- Psalterium Hebr. Gr. Chald. et Lat. Colon. 1518. fol.
- Psalterium Hebr. Chald. Gr. Lat. et Germ. studio *Jo. Draconitis*. Witteb. 1565. fol.
- Duodecas Aureorum Psalmorum Davidicorum, eorum, qui sunt praecipui prophetici de Jesu Christo, nempe II, VIII, XVI, XXII, XL, XLV, LXVIII, LXIX, LXXII, XCVII, CX et CXVIII. Hebr. Chald. cum Lat. versione, et Graec. Brem. 1614. 8.
- Psalterium Hebr. Chald. Syr. Arab. Gr. et Lat. cum interpretatione *Jac. Gerschovii*. Rostoch. 1643. fol.
- Psalmus CXIX. Hebr. Chald. Syr. et Arab. cum commentariis Rabb., e regione posita versione textuum istorum Latina et notarum Masorethicarum. Argentorati. 1700. 4.
- Targum in Proverbia, editum opera *Jo. Merceri*. Paris 1561. 4.
- Proverbia Salomonis Hebr. Chald. Gr. Lat. et Germ., studio *Jo. Draconitis*. Witteb. 1565. fol.
- Targum in Jobum Latine versum opera *Victorii Scialac*. Rom. 1618. 8.
- Liber Ijobi Chaldaice et Latine cum notis, item Graece *συχρηῶς* cum variantibus Lectionibus, ed. *Jo. Terentius*. Franekerae 1663. 4.
- Canticum Canticorum Hebr. et Chald. addita versione Hispanica cum commentario *R. Abraham Laniado*. Venet. 1619. 4.
- Canticum Canticorum Chald. cum versione Italica. Venet. 1672. 8. per *Christoph. Ambrosini*.
- Canticum Canticorum et Ecclesiastes Chaldaice et Latine per *Oswaldum Schreckenfuchsium*. Basil. 1553. 8.



- Targum Koheleth h. e. Chaldaica Paraphrasis Ecclesiastis Latina facta auctore *Pet. Costo*, cui Salomonis Ecclesiasten ex translatione Vulgata adversum posuimus. Lugduni 1554. 4. apud Matthiam Bonhomme.
- Targum in Ecclesiasten, emendatum per *Jo. Mercerum*. Paris 1562. 4.
- Targum in Ruth cum versione Lat. et scholiis *Jo. Merceri*. Paris 1564. 4.
- Collegium Rabbinico-Biblicum studio *I. Benedicti Carpzovii* et filii ejus. Lips. 1703. 4.  
(Continet librum Ruth Hebr. et Chald. cum vers. Lat., Masora utraque et commentariis Rabb.)  
ed. II. cura *Adriani Relandi*. Troj. ad Rh. 1710. 8.
- Targum II. in Esther cum Ketubiin. Venet. 1518. fol. apud Dan. Bombergium.
- Targum duplex in Esther cum Targum Jonathanis in Pentateuchum. Basil. 1607. fol. apud Conr. Waldkirch.
- Versio Germanica rhythmica Targum II. in Esther. Amstelod. 1649. 4.
- Targum Prius et Posterius in Estheram, nunc primum urbe donatum et in linguam Latinam translatum, studio et opera *Franc. Taileri*, Angli. Londoni 1655. 4.
- Paraphrasis Chaldaica, libri Chronicorum — cura *Matthaei Beckii*. T. I. Augustae Vindelic. 1680. T. II. 1683. 4.
- Paraphrasis Chaldaica in librum priorem et posteriorem Chronicorum — ed. *Dav. Wilkins*. Amstelod. 1715. 4.

## NO. II. TALMUD, MISHNA, GEMARA.

Gr. p. 10.

The writings of the Jews, which are known under these designations, contain their most important traditions, and an acquaintance with them, forms, even at the present day, an essential part of a learned education among the Jews. Zunz, in his *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden*, etc. (Berlin, 1832), has treated largely of these collections, and has there given one of the most exact, authentic accounts of them to be found in any work. Comp. especially pp. 45—61. The student is referred also to an excellent article on the same subject in the *Bibl. Repository*, Oct. 1839, by the late Dr. Nordheimer, himself a Jew by birth and thoroughly skilled in Rabbinic studies. See also the additions of Dr. Robinson in Calmet's *Dict.*, pp. 609 and 876.

A few paragraphs will present all which it is necessary to exhibit in this connection. The term *Mishna* signifies *second law* (מִשְׁנָה, from שָׁנָה *to repeat*), and is so called in distinction from the first or written law, in the Pentateuch. It contains, according to the popular Jewish belief, the oral instructions and explanations which Moses is said to have received from God at the time of the giving of the law on Sinai, and

which he directed to be taught to the people by their religious teachers, as of equal authority with the written word itself. These traditions were at length collected into a single body, about the middle of the second century, and compose the Mishna. This work was performed chiefly by Rabbi Judah the Holy, as he is called. Maimonides, as cited by Dr. Nordheimer, represents the contents of this collection as somewhat more miscellaneous and less unique in their origin. He says that from the death of Moses until this compilation was formed, "no book had been composed for public instruction containing the oral law; but in every generation the chief of the tribunal or the prophet who lived at the time, made memoranda of what he had heard from his predecessors and instructors, and communicated it orally to the people. In like manner each individual committed to writing for his own use, and according to the degree of his ability, the oral laws and the information he had received respecting the interpretation of the Bible, with the various decisions that had been pronounced in every age, and sanctioned by the authority of the grand tribunal."

The *Gemara* (גמרא *completion*, from גמר *to complete*) is a commentary on the Mishna. It has its name from its professed supplementary character as completing or finishing the Mishna of Rabbi Judah. This Gemara consists of two portions, one of which is known as the Jerusalem Gemara, the other as the Babylonian. The former was written at Tiberias, which was the seat of a flourishing Jewish school, by Rabbi Jochanan; and cannot be referred to a later period, says Zunz, than the first half of the fourth century. It was called the Jerusalem Gemara either from the dialect in which it was written, or because it represented the views of the Palestine Jews, whose capital was Jerusalem. The Babylonian Gemara was composed at Babylon, and contains evidence of having been written with a knowledge of the Jerusalem Gemara. It is the work of Rabbi Ashi, and his cotemporary and friend Rabbi Abhina, who lived near the beginning of the fifth century; though some additions appear to have been made to it at the close of this century by another hand, Rabbi Jose. Both of these works had the common object of presenting an explanation of the Mishna, and at the same time of adding to it the important decisions on questions of the law, which had been received into the established religious code since the time of Rabbi Judah. "They contain also," says Nordheimer, "historical and biographical notices, legends, disquisitions on astronomy and sympathetic medicine, aphorisms, apologues, parables, short and pithy sermons, and rules of ethics and of practical wisdom in general." Considering the range of human in-

quiries at that period, it is not easy to see what else they could have contained. Of the character of many of these traditions in their bearing on the Scriptures, sufficiently clear intimations are furnished in the New Testament. An analysis of the contents of the Babylonian Talmud may be found in the Repository as already referred to.

*Talmud* (תַּלְמוּד *doctrine*, from the Chaldee לָמַד *to teach*) is a general term applied both to the Mishna and the two Gemaras. The Mishna constitutes what may be called the text of this body of Jewish traditions—the Gemaras, a running commentary on this text; while, under the appellation of Talmud, we include at once both the text and the commentary. Some parts of the Talmud, as originally constituted, have been lost; but the portions that remain compose, as usually printed, twelve large folio volumes.

### NO. III. IS THE ARAMAEAN STILL SPOKEN IN THE EAST?

Gr. p. 19.

The statement of Dr. Winer in regard to the utter extinction of the Aramaean as a living language, requires correction. Had the reports of the most recent travellers in the East fallen under his notice, he would certainly have modified the unqualified representation which he has made on this subject. It is undoubtedly true that neither the Chaldee nor the Syriac exists any longer, in the precise form in which the ancient monuments of these dialects present them to us; but that a product of the Aramaean, or rather the Aramaean itself in its essential features is still spoken in Asia, is now established beyond all dispute. It will be sufficient to adduce in confirmation of this the testimony of Rev. J. Perkins, D. D., a missionary from this country at the present time among the Nestorians of Oróomiah. In his work *Residence in Persia among the Nestorians*, p. 11 sq., he says:

“Their ancient language is the *Syriac*. This language is still the *literary* language of the Nestorians. Their books are nearly all written in it. They conduct their epistolary correspondence in it; and though a *dead* language, the best educated of their clergy become able to converse in it with fluency. Their *written* character differs considerably from that of the western, or Jacobite, Syrians, which is the character best known to European scholars.

“There are twenty-two consonants in the present language of the Nestorians, the same as in the ancient Syriac, with a modification of *Gimel* (g), by a scratch of the pen underneath to express j, ch or gh; and of *Pe* (p) by a half Vav placed under it, to express ph. B, G, D, K, P, and Th, are also subject to aspiration, which is indicated by a point



below them and the reverse by a point above, the same as in the ancient language. There are seven vowels, corresponding to long *a*, short *a*, long *e*, short *e*, long and short *i*, long *o* and double *o*, or *u*. The vowels used by the Nestorians are *points*, and not the Greek vowels inverted, as used by the Western Syrians; and where the latter use *omicron* (short *ö*), as in *Alóho*, God, the Nestorians use the open sound of *a*, as *Aláha*, God.

“The *vernacular* language of the Nestorians, is a modern dialect of the ancient Syriac, much barbarized by inversions, contractions, and abbreviations, and by the introduction of a great number of Persian, Koordish and Turkish words, each class prevailing respectively in a particular district, in proportion as it is situated near to the people using either of those languages. Though thus corrupted, however, as now spoken by the Nestorians, the body of the language comes directly from the venerable ancient Syriac, as clearly as the modern Greek comes from the ancient. It is a softer language than the ancient Syriac, its guttural words being fewer, and its nouns even more extensively ending in open vowel sounds. The accent is almost invariably upon the penult syllable. The noun is declined by means of a preposition, having properly no *construct* state, though the first of two nouns has an affix pronoun, indicating possession,—thus, *Bróonee*, (*his son*, instead of *Bróona, son*,) *d'Oráham*, son of Abraham. The objective case, after an active verb, is indicated by the particle, *l*, prefixed; the dative is expressed by the same particle, meaning *to*, or *for*; and the ablative is governed by prepositions. The passive voice is formed by a distinct auxiliary verb, and not by a syllable prefixed, as in the ancient language. The Nestorians of the Koordish mountains speak dialects more nearly resembling the ancient Syriac, both in words and in sound, than the inhabitants of Oróomiah, alike from their limited intercourse with foreign nations and their more rude and hardy character.”

---

#### NO. IV. THE ZABIAN DIALECT.

Gr. p. 30.

This is the dialect of an early religious sect (Christian, it has been sometimes called,) variously known as the Zabians, Nazoraean, Mendeans, or Christians of St. John. Neander (*Allg. Gesch. etc.* II. p. 646), derives the first of these names from ܙܒܝܐܢܝܐ i. e. *βαπτισται*; but some others regard it as a geographical term, and suppose it to refer to the country where the Zabians dwelt. A remnant of this sect, as it is generally believed to be, was discovered about the middle of the 17th century, by certain Carmelite missionaries, in the region of Basrah and Susa. These missionaries applied to them the name of Johannites or St. John Christians; although they called themselves Nazoraean or Mendeans. The account which they give of their origin is that they came

from the Jordan, and were compelled to escape thence in consequence of the persecutions of the Mohammedans. "There is reason to believe," says Neander, "that they are the descendants of certain disciples of John the Baptist, who after the martyrdom of the latter still adhered to his cause, instead of attaching themselves to Christ; and who thus took, contrary to the spirit and instructions of their master, a hostile direction against Christianity." The Zabian dialect is the dialect of this people, and contains their sacred books. It belongs to the Aramaean family of languages, and occupies in its characteristics a sort of middle position between the Syriac and Chaldee. Its forms approach sometimes the one, sometimes the other; while occasionally the idiom is found to be altogether peculiar. In writing the language, its vowels, unlike the oriental dialects generally, are inserted in the same line with the other letters; though in printed works this peculiarity is not regarded, the vowel-signs being represented as in Syriac. The remains of this dialect are contained principally in the five books, entitled *Diwan*, Book of Adam, Book of John, *Kholasteh* and Book of the Zodiac. Of these the second only has been published in full: *Codex Nasaraeas, liber Adami appellatus, Syriace transcriptus Latineque redditus a Matth. Norberg*, 3 tom. Lond. Gothor. 1815—16. 4to. Copious extracts from the third, accompanied by a learned commentary, have been printed in Stäudlin's *Beiträge zur Philos. u. Gesch. der Rel. u. Sittenlehre*, Th. 5, and in his own *Museum für bibl. u. morgend. Lit.* Bd. I. St. 1. These remains are not without value to the Hebrew student, inasmuch as various words in the Hebrew language receive illustration from this source, the signification of which is otherwise obscure. As examples of this, Gesenius mentions בָּרָא, גָּמַד and גָּמֵד, נִבְרַשׁ, נִחַשׁ, etc. See these articles in his lexicon.

For fuller notices on this topic, comp., among others, Mosheim, v. I. p. 34 sq. n. 7. Gieseler, v. I. p. 40. n. 4. Neander, ut supra. Gesenius, in *Bibl. Repos.* v. III. p. 23. and in Ersh and Gruber's *Encyclop. art. Zabier*. Of the writers who have specially investigated this dialect or illustrated in any way the history of the sect, a complete list will be found in Danz's *Univ. Wörterbuch der theol. kirch. u. rel. Literat.* p. 1024. The principal of these, in addition to those already mentioned, are Walch, Barkey, Tychsen, Bruns, Lorsbach, Brammer, and Grégoire.

ms









